

January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank T. Bow.....	General counsel, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	\$4,821.30
Oscar L. Hume.....	Investigator, Jan. 1 to May 1, 1948; staff director, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	3,262.46
Sylvia Deane.....	Clerk, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,682.30
J. Robert Brown.....	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,872.79
R. J. Hodson.....	Investigator, Apr. 19 to June 30, 1948.	1,202.56
Thomas F. Simpson.....	Investigator, Mar. 8 to June 30, 1948.	1,720.33
Hubert R. Moody.....	Investigator, Mar. 15 to June 15, 1948.	1,519.90
George C. Perkins.....	Investigator, May 1 to June 15, 1948.	751.61
A. J. Watson.....	Auditor, Mar. 21, 1948.	1,749.48
L. M. Dodge.....	Auditor, Mar. 14 to May 31, 1948.	1,735.34
Charlotte C. Garver.....	Secretary, Feb. 24 to Apr. 24, 1948.	586.44
Elizabeth Voth.....	Secretary, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	622.82
Total.....		23,527.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$86,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....16,068.28

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.....34,080.42

Total amount expended from May 1 to June 30, 1948.....50,148.70

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948.....35,851.30

FOREST A. HARNES,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS JULY 15, 1948.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Willis J. Ballinger.....	Economic counsel.....	\$3,999.78
Arvilla M. Benson.....	Stenographer.....	1,661.52
J. G. Crost.....	Staff investigator.....	727.84
Leo P. Cullinane.....	do.....	3,511.20
Margaret Denny.....	Stenographer.....	1,298.38
Virginia F. Flatley.....	do.....	1,399.44
James W. Foristell.....	Executive director.....	4,021.44
Margaret Koeln.....	Stenographer.....	982.97
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.....	File clerk.....	1,247.70
William J. Warmack.....	Accountant.....	55.55
Hilfred G. Wood.....	Stenographer.....	448.94
Paul O. Peters.....	Staff investigator.....	4,021.44

On hand, Jan. 1, 1948.....\$2,209.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....70,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....72,209.34

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1948.....28,719.83

Total amount expended.....

Balance unexpended as of.....43,489.51

WALTER C. FLOESER,
Chairman.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we have been privileged to enter upon a new day laden with innumerable blessings and filled with tasks which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

May this moment of fellowship in prayer be radiant with insight and inspiration as we address ourselves humbly and confidently to every duty and responsibility.

Help us to make a more daring trial of those moral and spiritual values which Thou hast ordained. Show us how we may implement them in the building of a social order in which mankind shall find its joy and peace.

In the name of the Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Tuesday, July 27, be approved without reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the acting majority leader make a statement as to the plans of the majority for today's business.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be happy to do that. We are now proceeding under the morning hour. It was my intention to ask unanimous consent—and if the Senator prefers, I shall make the request now—that at the conclusion of the morning business—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to state that the approval of the Journal is the first order of business.

Mr. WHERRY. I will state now that a unanimous-consent request will be proposed, which I hope will be agreeable, that at the conclusion of the morning business the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

I think that statement should be made, because I always want to keep the Senate advised of the contemplated procedure. I think that today what we should do is to proceed with the routine business of the morning hour, such as the introduction of bills and resolutions, and then if there are any speeches to be made they can be made at the proper time, following which the Senate should recess until tomorrow at noon. That is the procedure contemplated by the acting majority leader, and no other business is to be undertaken. So I can assure, and do assure, the distinguished Senator from Georgia that if the Journal is approved I shall immediately ask unanimous consent—and I am satisfied that it will be agreeable—that at the conclusion of the morning business, if the hour of 3 o'clock has not arrived, the Senate shall proceed to the considera-

tion of Senate bill 2644. So once again I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire if the Chair ruled that the unanimous-consent request was not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the Chair's view that the Journal has to be disposed of one way or the other as the first order of business, but, upon reflection, the Chair is of the opinion that a unanimous-consent agreement can probably be entered into by the Senate at any time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was certain of that, and I should like to have the Chair submit the unanimous-consent request proposed by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The Chair will submit the unanimous-consent proposal just made by the Senator from Nebraska. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The question recurs on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska regarding the approval of the Journal. Without objection, the Journal is approved.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under Public Law 636, the President pro tempore must appoint four Senators as members of the Washington and Lee Bicentennial Commission. The Chair appoints the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

REPORT ON FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, during which the flow of United States supplies to Austria, France, and Italy accomplished the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947—"to alleviate conditions of hunger and cold and prevent serious economic retrogression."

Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act, this report also includes the statements of the governments of Austria, France, and Italy on the method of distribution and use of commodities made available under the act; the itemized list of commodities supplied each government, the average price at which each commodity was sold, and the gross proceeds derived from their sale; and the disposition of local currencies derived from these sales.

The supplies provided by the United States have freed the peoples of these

three countries temporarily from the fear of starvation and want and enabled them to hold their economy intact until a long-range program could help them and other countries to a general European reconstruction. To the peoples of these countries, however, the gift of these supplies by the people of the United States meant something more—this aid represented also a symbol of hope for their future.

To us, the American people, our aid was an act of faith in a future in which freemen shall prevail. The freely expressed will of the Italian people in their national election has already confirmed that faith.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1948.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WITHDRAWAL OF PLAN FOR CONSERVATION OF GRAIN BY BREWING INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture withdrawing compliance with the voluntary plan for the conservation of grain by the brewing industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PROJECTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects and of the request for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various members of the steel industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 10 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Viggo John Schmidt, Armando Pinto y Bisquerra, and Angele Charlotte Douthe nee Ravis or Simone Ravis or Simone Douthe, whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on December 15, 1947, January 15, and February 15, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Camillo Orestes Rafael Faneral y Bertini from a report relating to aliens whose deportation was sus-

pending by the Attorney General more than 6 months ago, and transmitted to the Senate on May 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR WARM-AIR HEATING EQUIPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing and of the request for compliance therewith issued by the Secretary of Commerce to the various steel producers and steel consumers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIBERATION MEMORIAL STAMPS FOR GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a petition of the Guam Congress regarding a joint resolution passed by that Congress for the printing and issuance of Liberation Day memorial stamps on July 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL SUBMARINE CHASER TO UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the University of North Carolina had requested the Navy Department to transfer a submarine chaser for use by that university in connection with oceanographic and topographic studies and with surveys of the fishing grounds which are under the jurisdiction of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each, employed at the United States Naval Postgraduate School as a separate activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOHN I. MALARIN

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John I. Malarin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Post Office Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and estimated cost of handling for the period July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON GOOSEBERRY PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Gooseberry project, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the acts of the fourth regular session of

the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 9 to April 15, 1948 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the forty-seventh annual report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDINANCES OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STOCK PILING BY MUNITIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Military Establishment Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report detailing the activities of that Board with respect to stock piling for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX., AND PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE AND SALE OF TIN METAL

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COORDINATION OF FORWARDING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (No. 15) of the action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MERCHANT SHIP SALES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on that Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON THE MERGER MOVEMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Merger Movement: A Summary Report" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL STEEL CARTELS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "International Steel Cartels" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM IMPLEMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "Manufacture and Distribution of Farm Implements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CARTEL

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "The International Electrical Equipment Cartel" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY AND CAPACITY OF GENERATING PLANTS AND POWER MARKET SURVEY, COLORADO RIVER

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting two reports entitled "Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants in the United States," for the year 1946, and "Power Market Survey, Colorado River, Upper Basin, Part I—Power Requirements" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth annual report of that Administration for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting a report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 199)

A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Irish-American Unified Society, Yonkers, N. Y., favoring the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Manhattan Wallace for President Conference, New York, N. Y., favoring the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House

of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by F. Ben Brillantes, secretary general, Philippine Ex-Political Prisoners' Association, Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant benefits to Filipino internees in Japanese prisons during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Morton I. E. Erlichman, of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the loyalty probe of Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Alliance of Postal Employees, in convention at Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by District 50 of the Lions International, Walluku, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Arizona-United States Cancer Cure Society, signed by James O. McDowell, of Bisbee, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to purchase a cancer-cure salve from Dr. Agnew, of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the national convocation of Kappa Delta Rho Fraternity, in Chicago, Ill., favoring an increased exemption on income-tax payments to students in all accredited institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Legion, Washington, D. C., signed by John Thomas Taylor, director, National Legislative Commission, praying for the enactment of House bill 4488, to create the Veterans' Homestead Act, and recommending the enactment of other legislation beneficial to veterans of World Wars I and II (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Conference for the Preservation and Advancement of Independent Business, of New York, N. Y., relating to inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., relating to price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Max J. Oberhauser, of Butte, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce postage rates on gift parcels to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Western Plant Board, Reno, Nev., favoring authority for airplane inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKES:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine

"Whereas through the sale of our tankers and cargo carriers abroad, the export of our steel, and the failure to grant authority for the construction of needed merchant tonnage at home, our merchant marine and our shipbuilding activities have suffered drastic decline; and

"Whereas while our position in world shipping has thus deteriorated, other nations have achieved new highs in ship construction; and

"Whereas we have learned that we must depend upon our own resources of ships and

shipbuilding for our national defense and security; and

"Whereas the present world situation requires that the United States stand fully prepared against any emergency: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant-shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine.

"2. That the Secretary of State be and is hereby directed to transmit immediately following the passage of this joint resolution a copy thereof, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, and the Maritime Commission.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved July 16, 1948."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

RESOLUTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention at Hagerstown, Md., May 7-9, 1948. It calls attention to a matter of vital interest, particularly to disabled veterans, and requests that employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, give preference in employment to members of the armed forces returning to civilian life, with highest priority for those who have been disabled in the service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas there appears to be a tendency on the part of employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, to forget the promise made by the citizens of this country through their legislators and the Congress that when the members of the armed forces would return to civilian life that they would be given preference for civilian employment and this preference as to those disabled in service would receive the highest of all such preference;

"Whereas this tendency is being evidenced by action of employers not only in private industry but also the State and Federal Governments and by various bills which have been introduced in the legislature and the Congress, to weaken that preference and in some cases to eliminate: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled at Hagerstown, Md., these 7th to 9th days of May 1948, That we reaffirm employment resolution No. 21, adopted at the 1947 national convention of the Disabled American Veterans and hereby repeat that resolution part as the resolution of this department convention:

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual

convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17, 1947, That we do hereby condemn any and all efforts that may be made by any other organization or individual to endeavor to take away any benefits that have previously been extended by Congress, or by any Federal agency, to service-disabled veterans, under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, or of any other laws, Executive order, regulations, instructions, or policies; and be it further

"Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual national convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17-23, 1947, That the Disabled American Veterans shall use every resource to fight against any efforts to enact any laws in the United States Congress, or in any State, or any action through any governmental agency of the Federal Government, of any State, or of any municipality which would eliminate any rights, privileges, preferences, or benefits for any service-disabled veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution with an appropriate statement be personally presented by the department commander and the appropriate member of his staff to the Governor of the State of Maryland and to each Member of Congress from the State of Maryland.

"HAILE CHISHOLM,
"Commander, Bethesda-Chevy Chase
Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American
Veterans."

The above resolution passed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, assembled at Hagerstown, Md., department convention, May 7-9, 1948.

JAMES F. AUBREY, Sr.,
Department Commander, 1948-49 Term.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of June 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
June 30, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of June, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, \$5,905.20.

Fedele P. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, \$9,975.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Chairman.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JUNE 30, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report

showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from December 31, 1947, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Meredith, executive director.....	\$10,000.00	\$5,000.00
Raymond R. Dickey, chief counsel.....	9,050.11	4,525.06
Bertram H. Wimer, chief investigator.....	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert J. Wolken, special investigator.....	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert E. Johnson, special counsel.....	125.00	3,600.96
Catherine Guyon, consultant.....	6,522.05	3,261.03
Homer Zopf, special investigator.....	125.00	1,647.18
William Broadgate, special counsel.....	125.00	1,659.65
Paul Hadlick, special counsel.....	125.00	1,333.30
Maxwell Dickey, special investigator.....	125.00	888.87
Allene J. Loveland, secretary.....	3,792.09	1,896.05
Pearl Mae Nichols, secretary.....	3,792.09	1,896.05
Dorothy Holshouser, editorial secretary.....	3,792.09	1,896.05
Mrs. Grace McNamara, secretary.....	3,212.80	1,606.40
Mrs. Alma Youse, secretary.....	3,212.80	1,606.40
Charlotte Southmayd, clerk.....	3,212.80	1,606.40
Virginia Lee Bauer, file clerk.....	2,633.40	1,316.70
Gene Wynes, messenger.....	2,004.20	229.01
John M. Payne, messenger.....	2,004.20	923.05
Jeanne M. Larson, clerk-typist.....	2,467.87	482.30
Marvel B. Spacensky, clerk-typist.....	2,467.87	113.00
John M. Frier, special investigator.....	125.00	968.10

¹ Per diem.
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....\$215,000.00
Amount expended.....142,027.08

Balance unexpended.....72,972.92

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 2898, to increase personal income tax exemptions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2899. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2900. A bill to authorize the construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2901. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 2902, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2903. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARATHY:

S. 2904. A bill to authorize the sale of the war housing project known as Custerdale in Manitowoc, Wis., to the city of Manitowoc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARATHY (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2905. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken

areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2906. A bill for the relief of Public School District No. 17, Winnebago, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate bill 2907, to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 2908, to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia introduced Senate bill 2909, to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. McKELLAR):

S. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution requiring persons and organizations registered as lobbyists to file weekly reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF PERSONAL INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 2898) to increase personal income-tax exemptions, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement as to the purposes of the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arkansas to make a brief statement concerning the bill he has just introduced? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Have we reached the order of petitions and memorials?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order of petitions and memorials was reached, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asked unanimous consent to address the Senate in connection with the measure he has introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the Chair if following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced is to increase the personal exemption of Federal income-tax payers. After three long battles in the Congress we finally enacted into law at the regular session of Congress, over Presidential veto, a tax bill giving relief to all personal income-tax payers. There was a sharp difference of opinion with respect to the merits of the bill. There are those who still contend that it was and is simply a bill to help the rich and for the relief of the rich and not a bill to help the small-income taxpayer, who needs relief the most. Notwithstanding the criticism that has been made of the bill as finally enacted, respecting which I also voted to override the President's veto, I am sure we can all agree that the bill did not give as much relief to small-income earners as they deserve, and as much as we would have liked to have given them. But, Mr. President, those who criticize other provisions of the bill also would criticize the Congress for having removed the grossest inequity and discrimination that has existed in our tax structure. I refer, of course, to the split-income provision granting this right to the husbands and wives of 38 States of the Union, a privilege only enjoyed heretofore by 12 States that have community-property laws. It is also to criticize and condemn the effort of this Congress to give relief in small measure, at least, to the low-income groups of this Nation who now have to pay income taxes on their salaries and their small incomes, all of which are needed if they are to purchase and have the actual minimum essentials of life.

With the high national income which we have in this Nation today, with wages higher than ever before in the history of the Nation, with farm income at a peak, and with the cost of living, about which we hear so much, at possibly the highest level in the history of the Nation, the small-income groups are in real distress. If this is an extraordinary session of Congress to deal with urgent matters and to give relief to those who are oppressed, then this is a good way to start. Let us increase the personal income-tax exemptions so as to give relief to those who need it most.

The President of the United States has criticized the bill which was passed, but he has offered no substitute for it. He has offered nothing which would grant relief to the groups which he says were "stabbed in the back." Obviously he does not want tax relief for anyone.

I do not know what the program of the Republican majority in Congress is or will finally be. I do not know whether we are to stay here and deliberate and try to legislate under the conditions; but if we are, I ask the Republican majority to take up this bill, give it appropriate hearings in committee, and bring it to the floor of the House and Senate so that we may vote upon it at this session. If there is an emergency, if there is distress, and if there is an effort to give relief to a large group, of millions of our taxpayers, in my opinion this is the way to do it.

I shall ask to have incorporated in the RECORD an analysis of the bill. I shall not take time to read it, but I shall make a brief statement about it.

The bill as introduced would increase personal exemptions from the present figure of \$600 per taxpayer to \$1,000 for a single taxpayer, and \$1,000 for each husband and wife. It may be said that that is a pretty big increase. It is, but it will afford relief that is badly needed.

The next question which arises is whether, under the present economic conditions and the heavy cost of Government today, together with the extraordinary programs which we are undertaking to finance, the Government can afford it. In other words, if this bill should pass, what would be the loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury? Having that question in mind, I have obtained estimates from the Treasury Department, and also from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Congress. Those estimates vary somewhat, but I shall place them in the RECORD. In obtaining the estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would result if the bill which I am introducing today should be enacted, I also asked for an estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would be incurred if personal exemptions were increased to \$900 per person, instead of \$1,000. Then, as a very minimum, I asked what the loss would be if personal exemptions were increased to \$750 per person. Let me give the estimates of the Treasury Department.

If personal exemptions were increased to \$1,000 per person, the loss of revenue based upon present national income would be \$3,600,000,000, and 12,600,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If personal exemptions were increased to \$900 per person instead of \$1,000, the loss of revenue which would result would be \$2,800,000,000, and 9,800,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If the committees, after hearings and due study of this legislation, should conclude that we could not at this time absorb that much loss, in view of the anticipated cost of government and anticipated revenues, then, as a very minimum to give relief to those groups of our citizens, I suggest that the committee amend the bill so as to increase exemptions to \$750 per person. If that were done, according to the Treasury estimate, a loss of revenue of only \$1,500,000,000 would be incurred, based upon present national income; and 5,500,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

Mr. President, a great many things are done and said in a campaign year for political purposes. We hear that charge on every hand. The whole atmosphere here is now charged with such accusations. I am not introducing this bill for political purposes. I have no opponent in this election. However, I know the hardship which is now being imposed on our income earners because of the high cost of living and because of the Federal tax which is withheld from their pay envelopes. I am introducing this bill in absolute sincerity, and in the hope that

if this Congress is to try to attend to those things which are of importance and are pressing, the Congress will take action on this bill. The bill would not go into effect until next year. It would afford no relief for this year's taxes, but would take effect for next year.

As I stated a moment ago, I do not know what course this Congress is to take or what will be the policy and procedure of the majority party. It may be that this will be nothing but a civil-rights session and a political dog fight from beginning to end. However, we can much better serve our country and serve the interest of humanity and human rights by dealing with legislation of this character and giving relief to the poor people of the Nation who are in distress, instead of wasting time in a political dog fight which would be a disgrace to the Congress of the United States.

The primary responsibility must rest upon him who has forced the issue and forced us into that situation; but the Republican Party can rise to true statesmanship at this hour. It does not have to force this battle; it can rise to true statesmanship and take up measures which are of importance in present world conditions and the condition in which this Government and this Nation finds itself. Thus the Republican Party can raise itself in the esteem of the American people. It is up to them. They have the majority. They have the power. I plead with them to take up measures of this character and others which will not tend to embitter any section of the country and will not serve to bring more strife and to emphasize abroad the disunity of our people. All that would be accomplished by such a course would be to furnish propaganda material to the enemies of this Nation, who would make far greater gains than either the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or anyone else would make by forcing legislation which is so reprehensible and distasteful to as loyal a section and group of Americans as can be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief analysis of the bill, together with Treasury Department estimates of loss of revenue.

There being no objection, the analysis and estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 2 of the attached bill would increase the basic personal income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer and his spouse from \$600 each to \$1,000 each. The remaining sections of the bill are of a technical nature, designed to implement the increase in exemptions provided for by section 2. The bill would not increase the exemptions now provided for old age, blindness, or dependents, but I recommend the appropriate committees study this with a view to making reasonable increases for them. A section by section analysis of the bill follows:

The first section gives the bill a short title "The Tax Reduction Act of 1949."

Section 2 provides for the increased personal exemptions described above.

Subsection (a) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income for which a declaration of estimated tax is required from \$600

per annum to \$1,000 per annum in order to make it correspond to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends sections 1622 (a) and 1622 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for withholding exemptions corresponding to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (c) of section 3 amends section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by dividing the substance of subparagraph (D) into two subparagraphs (D) and (E) relating, respectively, to the basic withholding exemption for the taxpayer's spouse and the withholding exemptions for old age and blindness of the taxpayer's spouse. This change makes it easier to refer to these exemptions in the table contained in section 1622 (b) (1) of the Code as it would be amended by section 3 (b) of the bill. Subsection (c) of section 3 also changes the language of section 1622 (h) (2) of the Code to make it applicable to the increased withholding exemptions provided for by section 3 (b) of the bill.

Subsection (d) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income or payment for which individual, fiduciary, and information returns are required from \$600 per annum to \$1,000 per annum, in view of the increased exemptions provided by section 2.

Subsection (e) of section 3 raises the credit allowed to an estate in lieu of the exemptions provided by section 25 (b) (1) of the code from \$600 to \$1,000 so that it corresponds to the increased personal exemption.

Subsection (f) of section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make such changes in the optional tax tables and the wage bracket withholding tables as may be necessary to reflect the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Section 4 of the bill makes the bill applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

Section 5 provides that the bill shall be applicable on a pro rata basis to taxable years beginning in 1948 and ending in 1949.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Assistant Counsel.

JULY 27, 1948.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, July 23, 1948.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: The following estimates are furnished pursuant to your telephone request of July 19, 1948, to Mr. Smith of this office.

The estimated revenue loss in a full year of operation with personal income of \$209,000,000,000 from various changes in the present law per capita exemptions for individuals is as follows:

1. Seven hundred and fifty dollars for single persons, \$1,500 for married couples, and \$600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, \$1,847,000,000.

2. Nine hundred dollars for single persons, \$1,800 for married couples, and \$600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, \$3,604,000,000.

3. One thousand dollars for single persons, \$2,000 for married couples, and \$600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, \$4,758,000,000.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

JULY 23, 1948.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of July 19, 1948, requesting the

estimated revenue loss from three plans for increasing the personal exemption of single persons and married persons from the present level of \$600 per capita.

The following table presents estimates for the calendar year 1948 of the decreases in tax liability and in the number of taxable-income recipients from present law under each of the three personal-exemption plans:

Personal exemptions			Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in tax liability from present law	Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in number of taxable-income recipients from present law
Single persons	Married couples	Dependents		
			Billions of dollars	Millions of income recipients
\$750.....	\$1,500	\$600	1.5	5.5
\$900.....	1,800	600	2.8	9.8
\$1,000.....	2,000	600	3.6	12.6

¹ It is assumed that the first dependent of a single person would qualify the taxpayer as the head of a family and entitle him to the married couple's exemption.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS SHERE,
Director of Tax Research.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. This is a simple amendment changing the date of eligibility of the displaced persons now in the camps in the American zones in Germany and Austria. The act, which was passed, fixed the date as December 22, 1945. Our bill calls for a change in this date to April 21, 1947, in order to make eligible a substantial number of displaced persons, estimated at 180,000, who came into our zones in Germany and Austria after 1945. Practically all of this group are persecuted Jewish people who fled into our camps, particularly from Poland, because of the fear of anti-Semitism. Since there are now only about 200,000 displaced persons of Jewish faith in our charge, the present law as it stands would exclude about 90 percent of the total. It is inconceivable that the United States should bar the eligibility of these unfortunate persecuted people who are people without a country and who above all others suffered from the tragic Hitler regime and its aftermath.

It is our belief that the passage of this bill will bring about a fuller cooperation of the other nations of the world with the United States in providing resettlement for all the DP groups. In this way we can cooperate most fully with the International Refugee Organization and can move toward a final solution of our responsibility for those who are in the American zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order during the morning

hour. May the Chair again respectfully suggest to Senators, it is perfectly obvious that during the special session it is going to be absolutely necessary to observe the rules of the Senate with some degree of fidelity. No discussion is possible in the morning hour, except by unanimous consent. If any Senator wishes to make remarks in the morning hour, the Chair asks that he obtain unanimous consent before he does so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, would the Chair allow a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Would it be inconsistent with the ruling of the Chair, just uttered and expressed, for me to ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me, in order that I may ask the privilege of having my name joined to the names of other Senators in favor of the bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is against the rules, but under the circumstances the request will be considered, in order to save time, and agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. As the Spaniard would say, muchas gracias.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator for asking to be identified with the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That takes care of that.

The bill (S. 2902) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide increased compensation for District of Columbia employees, on the same basis as that granted to other employees of Federal agencies and departments.

Having participated both as a member of the Senate Civil Service Committee and as a conferee on the pay increase bill in the closing hours of the session, in the prolonged discussions incident to consideration of the proposed increase, I am convinced that the cost-of-living increment given to other Federal employees is merited just as richly by the workers in the various District of Columbia offices and agencies.

The continuing upswing in the cost of practically all living essentials makes it imperative that these employees of the District of Columbia be given some assistance toward balancing the family budget.

The bill (S. 2907) to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLICITY OF PRICING POLICIES OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a

bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity of the pricing policies of certain large corporations, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2908) to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes (1) that mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression, all at a time when international recovery and world peace depend in great measure upon stopping inflation, and (2) that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American economy depends. The Congress believes that inflation will be checked if the pricing policies of these corporate giants are publicly reviewed before increased prices may be made effective, and to that end the provisions of this act are enacted.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(2) The term "essential commodity" means any commodity which basically affects the cost of living or industrial or agricultural production, as determined and made public from time to time by the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) The term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN PRICE INCREASES WITHOUT NOTICE

SEC. 3. No corporation in any industry engaged in the production of essential commodities for commerce, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in such industry, shall, either directly or through any subsidiary, affiliate, individual, or other person, fix any price for any essential commodity in excess of the price charged therefor by such producer in the ordinary channels of trade on July 27, 1948, until such corporation has complied with the provisions of section 4 of this act and until a public hearing has been held as required by such section. The Federal Trade Commission shall determine and make public from time to time the industries to which this section applies.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INCREASE PRICES—PUBLIC HEARING

SEC. 4. (a) Any corporation desiring to make any price increase referred to in sec-

tion 3 shall file with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, particularly describing the commodity or commodities to which any increase is to be applied and indicating the extent and proposed effective date of such increase. Not later than 30 days after such notice has been given the Federal Trade Commission shall call a public hearing on the proposed increase at which it shall be the duty of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine such corporation with respect to the reasons for and the justifiability of the proposed increase and to take testimony on the impact of such increase on the economy of the Nation. At such public hearing all persons desiring to be heard shall be allowed to appear and give testimony either for or against the proposed increase under rules to be prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission.

(b) For the purpose of any such hearing the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce under this act; and the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce may designate examiners or other personnel from their respective agencies to administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) The Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce shall make a joint report to the Congress upon such hearing and shall submit in connection therewith their joint or separate recommendations, if any, for additional action.

PENALTIES

SEC. 5. Any corporation violating the provisions of section 3, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in any such violation, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

PROTECTION AGAINST REPRISAL

SEC. 6. Any corporation which either directly or indirectly refuses to do business with any person by reason of the fact that such person has given testimony at any hearing held under section 4, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in such action, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and any such person who shall be injured in his business or property by the action of such corporation in so refusing, may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated so much as may be necessary to enable the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to carry out their respective functions under this act.

The statement by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE OR THE PROFITEERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Congress is face to face with the issue: The people or the profiteers.

Both major parties have recognized the plain fact that the cost of living is higher now than at any time in history. It will not do for Congress to waste its time in fruitless debate about who or what is responsible for this condition. It is here. The question is, What are we, the only legislative power of the Nation, going to do about it? We must act or drift. If we act, we can stop inflation now. If we drift, it will become steadily worse and create a constantly growing demand for more and more drastic action.

I am introducing a bill to hold inflation immediately by stopping price increases on basic commodities, the supply of which is controlled by a handful of corporate managers and the prices of which are likewise fixed by management.

When three or four giant corporations can fix the prices and the supply for the basic commodities in daily use by 140,000,000 Americans—and this is the situation—it is time to realize that the people of the United States have become the subjects of private economic government over which their Congress declines to exercise any restraining influence, although it has the constitutional power to do so.

As I have already pointed out, three meat-packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the processed meat consumed by all the people of the United States. They also fix the prices, and their corporate reports show that they are making record profits. There are 121 basic products in common use throughout the United States by business for industrial production and by the people for their daily living which are under such concentrated control that in 1937 more than 75 percent of the total output of each commodity was manufactured by only four firms. These commodities range from meat and corn sirup to steel, milk bottles, and cigarettes to gasoline, tires, tin cans, and window glass. There is scarcely a commodity in daily demand from the building of homes to living in them that is not subject to this concentrated control.

My proposal is simple—it is merely that no corporation engaged in the production of essential commodities, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in the industry, may increase the price for such a commodity without first filing with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase the price, and no such price will be permitted until within 30 days after the filing of such notice the Federal Trade Commission shall have called a public hearing on the proposed increase at which the producer shall be subjected to examination as to the reasons for and the justifiability for the proposed increase.

This proposal requires no new machinery. The Federal Trade Commission now has the power to conduct such investigations. The only thing new about this proposal is that the hearings shall be held before profiteering takes place and not afterward when it can do the people no good.

It will be effective because the giant corporations which control the supply and fix the prices of the commodities 140,000,000 people must buy will be unwilling to subject themselves to cross examination about their pricing policies and their gigantic profits.

The National City Bank of New York City, in its economic letter of June 1948, reported that the net income after taxes of the 100

largest manufacturing corporations increased in 1947 91 percent over the net income after taxes in 1945. The jump was from \$1,943,000,000 in 1945 to \$3,730,000,000. The income of these corporations is so great that they are plowing it back into plant expansion and thus gaining a still larger control over the production of industrial commodities in the United States.

Congress has not hesitated to enforce a cooling off period on organized labor which may not sell its commodity for the price it demands under the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act until a certain period of time has elapsed. If we can freeze the wages of labor, certainly we can freeze the prices at which concentrated business organization sells its products particularly when the public interest demands that Congress halt inflation.

These corporations are collectivist institutions which are managed not by their owners, the stockholders, but by hired executive managers. They are setting the pattern for political collectivism and unless Congress acts to stop this concentration of economic power the battle to prevent political collectivism in the United States will be on us before we know it.

The measure I suggest is a perfectly constitutional proposal. The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States gave to Congress the power to regulate commerce. This power does not belong to the President. It does not belong to the courts. It belongs to the Congress, and if the Members of Congress choose not to exercise this power, they will not only be abandoning the people to the profiteers but they will be abandoning their constitutional duty to protect a democratic economy in a democratic system.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FINANCE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Educational Facilities Finance Act," and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2909) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

I am offering today an educational facilities finance act, which might be an alternative to the Educational Finance Act passed by the Senate last April which has not been acted on by the House.

I voted against the Taft bill primarily because I knew the States could not get the kind of aid it proposed without Government control, which ultimately would involve the question of segregation. Even if the House should pass the bill in the form approved by the Senate, without injecting the segregation issue, there is no assurance that a future Congress will not amend the provisions under which the grants are made.

Moreover, the Taft bill would not solve the problem of Virginia or of other Southern States. It is not sufficient merely to increase the salaries of present teachers. We must have a more efficient system, which necessitates the consolidation of small units and that means new buildings for the grade

schools as well as for the high schools. This building program is the biggest need.

Under the plan proposed in my bill, schools could be built promptly by local agencies which would be allowed to repay their share of the cost in easy installments over a 20-year period. This would release funds that could be used for increasing teachers salaries and for other purposes.

Unlike the Taft bill, my proposal would not involve the Federal Government in a program of recurring annual contributions that would permanently increase the national budget. Nor would localities become so dependent on a Federal contribution that they would find themselves helpless to resist some future attempt to tie strings to the funds, dictating qualifications for teachers, prescribing curricula, or forbidding segregation.

I knew I was doing an unpopular thing in voting against the Taft bill because everyone recognizes the need for improving our education system. But I felt the long-range danger of that plan outweighed the advantage my State would immediately enjoy through receiving Federal funds that would be larger than the State's proportional contribution.

I feel that my bill has the advantages without the dangers of the Taft plan.

We need better schools in every part of the Nation and especially for the colored people of Virginia and the South. My State and others are trying to provide the necessary facilities with inadequate funds and I know of no better way to help them than by such a building program as I have proposed.

My bill would designate the RFC as fiscal agent for distributing \$300,000,000 of outright grants and for advancing another \$300,000,000 of loans to be secured by bonds of school districts. The interest rate on these bonds would be fixed at 2½ percent, making the money available as cheaply as possible without any cost to the Government for this portion of the program. The RFC is the best agency, it seems to me, for handling this program without exerting any pressure on the States or giving the Federal Government even a latent power to usurp the functions of local self-government in the important field of education.

Funds would be divided among the States on the basis of the proportion of the number of children of school age (5 to 17) in each State to the total number of children of this age in the Nation. Allocations within each State would be made by the State board of education or the agency performing similar functions and each local project would require approval by the State agency.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have just returned from several weeks spent in my home State of Indiana. On every hand and on the tip of almost every tongue there one hears the question, "Are we going to have war?"

For many months the newspaper correspondents and the radio commentators have poured out millions of words relative to the tense situation that now exists between this country and Soviet Russia.

Repeated requests have been made to the State Department and the administration by this body and by Members of the House of Representatives for complete information relative to the controversy over the situation in which we find ourselves in occupied Berlin.

Three years ago representatives of the United States took the lead, acting with representatives of 49 other nations, in

writing at San Francisco the Charter for the United Nations. This great world organization was launched in the belief and hope it would be a potent organization for settling international disputes and avoiding future armed conflict. It is time now to test the capabilities of the United Nations as an organization that can resolve international differences around the conference table and avoid the war which so many in our country believe is so imminent.

If the United Nations is a potent organization, then the American-Soviet controversy should be submitted to it for amicable settlement. If it is powerless to settle such differences, then in my opinion it is an impotent organization, lacking the possibilities of fulfilling the hope so fervently expressed at San Francisco and throughout the world 3 years ago.

I now offer a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the United States Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair in his capacity as a Senator from Michigan would have to object if there should be no other objection raised.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire if the Senator from Indiana desires to have the resolution taken up for consideration immediately without reference to the committee?

Mr. JENNER. I have asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I consider the problem one of the most important ones confronting this Nation and the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, without in any way passing on the substantive merits of what the Senator from Indiana says, it seems to me that a matter of this kind, being of such far-reaching character, should have the benefit of committee investigation and study.

Mr. JENNER. Why far reaching?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is very far reaching. I think it has all sorts of implications which involve the security and the peace of the world, and it seems to me that the resolution ought to have the benefit—and I say it is in the friendliest spirit to my friend from Indiana—of committee investigation and study. So for that reason at this moment I should feel constrained to object.

Mr. JENNER. The United Nations organization was set up 3 years ago. It is a functioning organization. Only recently it has been recommended that we appropriate \$65,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to build it a permanent home. So it is time to test the organization. If it is to exist as a going organization, if it is to fulfill the hope of peace of the people of the world, let us give it a chance to act and not to continue to circumvent every time an international problem arises.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a point of order. Are not the present proceedings out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion is out of order. The question is whether or not unanimous consent shall be given which the Senator from Indiana is asking.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule, or be referred, whichever the Senator from Indiana prefers. Which does the Senator prefer?

Mr. JENNER. I prefer that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 267), submitted by Mr. JENNER, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to restrictions imposed upon the movement of personnel, supplies, and materials between the occupation zones of Germany and the occupation sectors of Berlin should be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations organization and that the President should instruct the United States Representative in the Security Council to take such action as may be necessary to present this matter to the Security Council for immediate consideration and settlement.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called the Congress into extraordinary session. When I heard the President announce at the Philadelphia convention that he would call the Congress into session on the 26th day of July, I immediately made the statement that I would offer a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress immediately after they were called into session. I made that statement because I believed it would not be in the best interests of the people of the United States to have the Congress convene in session at this particular time.

If we could accomplish the two things the President has set forth in his message to Congress and has asked the Congress to accomplish, that would be all right. Let us read them now, as set forth in his statement:

The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things. First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

Those are the two things the President set forth. In his message other things are enumerated, but only by slight reference. Those two things could be the only reason for calling an extraordinary session of Congress.

I notice in the morning newspaper that it is stated that the Republican leaders of Congress plan a quick adjournment. The headline reads:

Republican leaders plan quick adjournment; special session is branded political maneuver; Truman asks for controls, housing action.

Those are the only two things mentioned there.

If the Congress could get down to business and could pass a proper housing bill and could do something about the rising cost of living, then the Congress could very well stay in session and do something. But judging from the rumors I hear, instead of taking up those two subjects, the Senate will attempt to take up the whole civil-rights program, which happened to be mentioned briefly on page 6 of the President's message to Congress, at the tail end of his message, so to speak. The President did not urge very strongly that anything be done about civil rights, as we observe if we read his message closely. That situation is not a national emergency at the present time.

Mr. President, what will develop here if an attempt is made at this session of the Congress to have the Congress, and particularly the Senate, enact civil-rights legislation? What will happen at this session? I fear that what will happen will be that the majority party in the Senate will bring up such matters as antilynching legislation and anti-poll-tax legislation. Probably anti-poll-tax legislation will be proposed first, judging from the word which comes on the grapevine, from which I receive my information. If we start the fight on anti-poll-tax legislation, the Republican Party knows what will happen, for it has a little bit of sense. The Republican Party knows very well that that will bring about a prolonged debate in the Senate. When that happens, let them not attempt to lay the blame at the feet of the southern Democrats, for we shall not be the ones who will undertake to bring up such legislation. I wish the world to know who brings those bills to the front, in an attempt to block the consideration of legislation needed at the present time in the United States.

I now offer my resolution, and I wish to read it to the Senate. It corresponds somewhat to the Republican adjournment resolution of the last session, so the Republicans cannot object to it. They can call the Congress back in session, if that should become necessary. I now read my resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 31, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

Sec. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. President, it will be noted that my resolution gives to the majority party the right to reconvene the Congress, and, of course, the President can recall it in case of dire emergency. At the present time, immediately after the two national

conventions and before the general election in November, Mr. President, you know as well as I do that there will be some nice politics played here, which probably will not be for the interests of the people of the United States, because—let us face facts—the majority party in the Senate, since I have been serving here, has not always acted for the best interests of the common people of America.

Let me again warn you, Mr. President, that we have had a bipartisan foreign program; but if the Congress stays in session 4 weeks, 5 weeks—it is out of the question to pass the necessary legislation in 2 weeks, 2 months, or what not—the Nation, and especially the Senate of the United States, will be stirred to such fever heat that the bipartisan foreign policy will no longer exist. The peace of the world will then probably have been jeopardized, and probably seeds will have been planted which will eventually develop and grow into a third world war. That is how serious the situation is as I see it.

Not only that; we want peace not only here in the Senate, we want peace on the home front. Mr. President, when such issues as civil rights are brought up, if you go down into my State you will find out what I am talking about. You will find down there that that issue is so hot they will hardly let me sit down when I return home. That issue is hot, it is stirring up strife and discontent here in the United States, making a fertile bed in which the Communists may plant their seed. Those who bring up that issue, I here and now tell them, are aiding and abetting the Communists. Communists thrive where there is discontent.

That being so, as I see it at the present time, nothing good can come out of this session of the Congress. For that reason, I am submitting this resolution, asking that it be printed and lie over, to be taken up either tomorrow or Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and will lie over under the rule.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair respectfully suggest that debate is not in order until the morning hour is concluded. The morning hour is nearly concluded. Debate will be in order shortly.

EMPLOYMENT OF PAGES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 268), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from July 22, 1948, to and including the third day following the final recess or adjournment of the Congress, at the basic rate of \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rules require that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee, but, by unanimous consent, the rules can be waived.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the rules be waived. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained permission for a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold sessions while the present session of Congress continues.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a matter which comes over from the previous session, and asks the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. When House bill 6959, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, came over from the House, the Senator from Louisiana objected to the second reading of the bill. Therefore the bill has never been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Louisiana is now willing to have the bill read the second time and referred to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will now be read the second time by title.

The bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over housing matters.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 261), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of S. 2833, a bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the resolution go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will go over.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by President Truman

at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARKLEY AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by him as temporary chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BARKLEY'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by him at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McMAHON before the Democratic National Convention on July 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject of the Democratic Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 PLATFORM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the 1948 platform of the Republican Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, accepting the nomination as President of the United States, delivered at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR WARREN

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Earl Warren, accepting nomination as Vice President of the United States, at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ISSUED BY REPUBLICAN LEADERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on July 27, 1948, by the Republican leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives with a view to its presentation to their respective Republican conferences for consideration, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

the record of the Eightieth Congress, delivered by Senator WHERRY before the Republican National Convention, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY FRANK M. DIXON AT SOUTHERN STATES CONVENTION

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Frank M. Dixon at the Southern States Convention held at Birmingham, Ala., July 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTINGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of civil rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettingill over the ABC network on July 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND STATES' RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTINGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast on the subject of civil rights and States' rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettingill over the ABC network on February 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Worcester Telegram of June 21, 1948, relating to the counting of electoral votes for President and Vice President, together with a statement prepared by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT UNITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony at the Conference Table," written by him and published in the July 1948 issue of the magazine *Partners*, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AND STATE TAXATION—LETTER FROM ROBERT B. DRESSER

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding State and Federal taxation, addressed by Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R. I., to Governor Hildreth, of Maine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ECONOMICS—ARTICLE BY HENRY HAZLITT

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic Platform Economics," written by Henry Hazlitt and published in *Newsweek* for July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY JOHN O'DONNELL

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, written under the headline "Capitol Stuff" in the July 28 issue of the *Washington Times-Herald*, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARRIVAL OF JET PLANES IN GERMANY—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TALBERT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the arrival of 16 American jet planes in Germany, written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the *New York Herald Tribune* of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX ON MARGARINE AND COLOR— STATEMENT BY HUNTER A. GIBBES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Federal tax on margarine and color, by Hunter A. Gibbes, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—WHEN AND HOW?—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Rights—When and How?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENING OF CONGRESS—LETTER FROM T. J. WERTENBAKER

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him under date of July 16, 1948, from Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, relating to the convening of Congress by the President, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States. After the long struggle we had in passing selective service legislation some 2 months ago, the statement in yesterday morning's newspapers that the President of the United States by Executive order had attempted to undo what the Senate did when the amendments were defeated here, makes it necessary for me, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to say here that it was my understanding with the Army officials at all the committee meetings that they would retain segregation. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read General Bradley's statement, but I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that the people of the United States may know what General Bradley thinks and what General Eisenhower testified to before our committee, regardless of what President Truman may say.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY TO KEEP SEGREGATION, BRADLEY SAYS— NUMBER OF DRAFTEES MAY BE FURLOUGHED BECAUSE OF HOUSING

FORT KNOX, KY., July 27.—Chief of Staff Gen. Omar Bradley told a news conference today that the Army will keep racial segregation as long as the Nation does.

"The Army is not out to make any social reforms," said Bradley. "The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it."

Lt. Gen. Willard Paul, director of personnel, said the Army might find it necessary to furlough a number of new draftees as soon as they are inducted because housing and training facilities possibly will not be available.

Bradley and Paul are here attending a 3-day conference of high-ranking officers studying the possible adaptation of universal military training policies to all Army training.

Bradley told the Army's top brass that they must treat incoming selectees in a way that will send them back to civilian life as friends of the Army.

"Sure, we will have discipline and the caste system and we will keep the men busy," Bradley declared, but he added "we must treat our men as individuals and not as rows of men lined up on the parade field before us."

The Army's Chief of Staff said the Army had itself to blame for its status as "the favorite whipping boy of the country." He told the high-ranking officers they must work to sell the Army to the public, "instead of blasting their superiors and bragging about low prices in the post exchange."

Bradley said the caste system will remain in the Army, "and we need to make no apologies for it." The caste system, Bradley said, is the same in industry, "and really it's only the just reward for those who work hardest."

Separate clubs will be maintained for officers and enlisted men to maintain respect for rank, Bradley said, but he added he saw nothing wrong with officers and enlisted men who are close friends attending private parties together.

PROPOSAL FOR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGE J. WAITES WARING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a telegram received by me from Mr. Alan Johnstone, of Newberry, S. C. I also request that my answer to Mr. Johnstone be printed.

In his telegram Mr. Johnstone requested me to bring impeachment proceedings against Federal Judge J. Waites Waring. In my reply I reminded Mr. Johnstone that, under the law, any such action must necessarily begin in the House of Representatives.

I have previously condemned Judge Waring for his actions in reaching beyond the jurisdiction of his court, and I still feel that he exceeded his authority in his orders to the Democratic Party of South Carolina. There is no precedent in South Carolina for his actions in a civil case.

I simply wanted to take this opportunity to say to the people of South Carolina and to my colleagues in the Senate that such action as has been requested of me can originate only in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the telegram and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBERRY, S. C.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Impeach Judge Waring in the Senate. These orders by which he makes war on South Carolina, white and black, and in which he has gone beserk and dishonors the memory of Woodrow Wilson, Senator Smith, and yourself. This setting aside of our best traditions of a good life together, fair play, and a fair hearing. For it is not the good conduct which the Constitution demands of a judge with life tenure. All our people, including Negro citizens, deserve better conduct than this and can no longer risk the prejudice it stirs up.

ALAN JOHNSTONE.

JULY 26, 1948.

ALAN JOHNSTONE,

Care of County Chairman,

County Campaign, Newberry, S. C.:

Yours. You are a lawyer and should know that impeachment proceedings must be brought in the House of Representatives.

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

body of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on July 8, 1948, before the National Education Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on the subject, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow teachers, and guests, I address you as fellow teachers because over a period of more than 20 years I too was entrusted with the great responsibility of teaching young men and women in the classrooms of three universities. I think I understand and appreciate some of the problems which confront the teaching profession and the school administrators of our country.

Of one thing you may be sure and that is I am well aware of the fact that neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has measured up as yet to its clear responsibility to put into effect a national policy which will assure an equality of educational opportunity for America's boys and girls.

I hold to the proposition that an educated citizenry is democracy's greatest strength and our Nation's greatest potential wealth. I say potential wealth because the sad fact is that we still must talk about equality of educational opportunity in America in terms of a future goal because equality of educational opportunity does not exist in fact in our country today.

It is not necessary for me to point out to you teachers and school administrators that in a very real sense the educational opportunities of an American boy or girl are still determined in a large measure by the State and locality in which he or she is born and raised through the period of schoolhood.

Unfortunately, the question as to whether or not those educational opportunities will be rich or poverty stricken depends upon the tax-producing economic assets of their local communities.

There are other barriers to providing our children of America, no matter where they live, with an equality of educational opportunities such as discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

However, the primary cause for the great disparity in educational opportunities in this country is the failure of the Congress of the United States to date to recognize the importance of making democracy work in this country by passing a fair and adequate Federal aid to education bill so that all of our boys and girls can enjoy the freedom, inspiration, and intellectual wealth which are the natural and inevitable products of enlightened minds.

Oh, yes, I know that S. 472, the Federal aid to education bill which several of us, including Senator THOMAS of Utah, co-sponsored in the Senate this year under the authorship of Mr. TAFT, of Ohio, was not a perfect bill in that it did not meet with the complete approval of all school authorities and of all educational groups in America. However, it was a vitally important bill in that it sought to establish the principle which needs to be established that our Federal Government does have a responsibility in providing funds on an equitable basis, subject to State administration, control and spending, so that there can be provided throughout the country at least a uniform minimum standard of educational opportunity for all our children.

I was happy to work for the passage of that bill through the Senate, knowing full well that if we could write it into the statute books of our Government we could perfect it in the future from time to time as we learned from experience through its administration.

If we were to wait for perfection in the bills which are considered by Congress or for unanimity of opinion of all parties interested

in a given bill, such as the Federal aid to education bill for example, we would never succeed in making social progress through legislation.

We were successful in passing S. 472 through the Senate but it died a smothering death in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

However, the issue of Federal aid to education is not dead and candidates for high political office of both major political parties must be required to face the issue until our Government keeps faith with the educational needs of the children of America.

Not only our politicians but our people, generally, need to ponder the truth of the teachings of Jefferson when he said:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be. Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

I hope you will pardon this rather long introduction to the subject matter of my address, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

However, as a constitutional liberal, I thought it particularly appropriate that I make clear to my audience at the outset of my speech my position on the issue of Federal aid to education.

I do not wish to give the impression that all members of the Republican Party in the last session of Congress share my view on this issue because, if they did, S. 472 would be a law today. Nevertheless I also wish to point out that if a sufficient number of Democrats in the last session of Congress had shared the views of those Republicans who were supporting Federal aid to education, S. 472 would have been enacted into law. In other words, I would point out to you that most issues involving social legislation, such as the Federal aid to education bill, cut across party lines in the Congress of the United States.

Although some politicians and party partisans seek to convince the American people that their party, be it Republican or Democratic, is chiefly responsible for all the good things accomplished by the Congress and the opposition party is responsible for all the shortcomings of the Congress, I hope that I shall always be nonpartisan enough to face the fact that coalitions and alignments of both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress of the United States are responsible for the passage of sound social legislation which seeks to promote social justice. I wish to add quickly that coalitions and alignments of both Republicans and Democrats also frequently succeed in blocking, smothering, or defeating legislation which seeks to promote the common good.

I do not think we help the cause of truth any in political campaigns by seeking to give the American people the impression that one's own party and the men in it are the only sincere advocates of the country's best welfare and that the opposition party and its leaders seek to destroy our constitutional rights as a free people.

Such blind partisanship and political extravaganzas make a very bad impression upon fair-minded voters and particularly upon independent voters, who hold the balance of power in every election, because such tactics are revolting to the average American's sense of fair play and sportsmanship.

Thus, from this platform tonight I would give the gratuitous advice to the thousands of campaign workers in my party who are going to wage a great campaign for a Republican victory in November to remember that we are not running against Franklin Roosevelt.

The members of my party, including candidates as well as campaign workers, should remember that Franklin Roosevelt was the choice for President of millions of American voters on four different occasions. Irrespective of what differences of opinion we may

hold as to his position and record on certain great issues, he, nevertheless, will be recorded in history as both a great American President and as a great world statesman.

I say that as a Republican who openly campaigned against him in 1944 when I campaigned in that year, as I shall again in the campaign this year, for that great leader of the Republican Party, the distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey.

However, my party needs to remember that Franklin Roosevelt is dead and he is entitled to the solemn respect due the dead and his record is entitled to be adjudged by history.

Likewise, I would advise my party that in the campaign about to start it is not running against the New Deal because the New Deal also is dead.

I think the American people, particularly the independent voters, are weary of the type of Republican political speech which predominated entirely too much at the recent Republican convention and which took the form of adjective rattling of the skeleton of the New Deal.

Intellectual honesty should compel us all to admit that a considerable portion of the social legislation which was passed during the Democratic administration in the 1930's is here to stay, and there is not one word in the Republican platform which indicates any intention on the part of my party to repeal it.

Furthermore, intellectual honesty should compel us also to admit that the plans for such legislation in many instances were first made during the Hoover administration, and had it not been for the tragic economic collapse which confronted Hoover in 1932, for which he has received much unjustifiable blame, many of the reforms of the thirties would have developed under a Republican administration.

When I say that, I do not attempt to take any credit away from the Democratic Party which is due it, but I state what I think any student of the political history of that era must admit is true.

In contrast with the blind partisanship which characterized some of the speeches at the recent Republican convention, and I predict that there will be similar partisan speeches at the forthcoming Democratic convention, I would call your attention to the great speech of statesmanship and sound Republican philosophy which ex-President Herbert Hoover enunciated at the Republican convention at Philadelphia.

Time does not permit me to review it in detail but I recommend it to you for required reading if you seek understanding of the constitutional liberalism of the Republican Party. In passing, I would pause on this occasion only to quote the following paragraphs from President Hoover's Philadelphia speech:

"The problems which confront us far transcend partisan action and I do not propose to speak in that sense tonight.

"What is done here, what you do here, will affect the destiny of our country beyond any estimation of this moment. For you are more than ever before the trustees of a great cause, the cause for which this party was founded, the cause of human liberty.

"The only obstacle to the annihilation of freedom has been the United States of America. Only as long as the United States is free and strong will human liberty survive in a world frustrated and devastated by these two wars.

"It is our interest and, above all, in the interest of liberty throughout the world, that we aid in giving strength and unity to the nations of western Europe. It is only thus that we can restore a balance of power in the world able to resist the hordes from the Eurasian steppes who would ruin western civilization.

"There are other warning signs. Our reputed prosperity has begun to walk on two stilts: one is the forced draft of exporting

more than our surplus through relief; the other is a great armament program. We cannot go higher on these stilts, or we will break a leg getting down.

"We should have no illusions. To the devastating Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, modern civilization has added two more. They are high taxes and inflation. They are close by.

"Therefore, with full compassion for those nations in difficulties, certain matters in aid to them must be recognized on both sides of the world.

"Our task is solely to aid their reconstruction. We can provide only bare necessities. There is no room for nonessentials, profligacy, or inefficiency.

"We must insist that reconstruction of western Europe be as a whole. That must include the restoration of the productivity of Germany, or Europe will die. We need neither forget nor condone Nazi guilt, but a free world must not poison its concepts of life by accepting malice and hatred as a guide. Otherwise, not only will our efforts fail, but the American taxpayer will be bled white supporting an idle and despairing German people.

"Our difficulty lies not so much with obnoxious Communists in our midst as with the fuzzy-minded people who think we can have totalitarian economics in the hands of bureaucracy, and at the same time have personal liberty for the people and representative government in the Nation. Their confused thinking convinces them that they are liberals—but if they are liberals, they have liberalism without liberty. Nor are they middle of the roaders as they claim to be: they are a half-way house to totalitarianism.

"They should note that in every one of the countries of Europe where 400,000,000 people are now enslaved by the Communists, it has been the totalitarian liberals who provided the ladders upon which the Communist pirates have boarded the ship of state.

"Great as your problems are, they are no greater than Americans have met before your time. You are no less able or courageous than they were.

"Therefore, I repeat, what you say and do here is of transcendent importance.

"If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope.

"If you produce no leadership here, no virile fighter for the right, you will have done nothing of historic significance."

Thus, in keeping faith with the challenge and statesmanship of President Hoover's speech, I would reiterate that in the forthcoming campaign my party is not running against the New Deal.

To the extent that the Republican Party is running against anything, it is running against the record of the Truman administration. However, my party should do much more than run against the Truman record in this campaign. It must, and I am sure it will, wage this campaign in support of certain specific issues basic to the international security and domestic economic stability of our country, including specific administrative policies of government essential to attaining those objectives.

I offer to you the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia as a broad outline of the Republican campaign. Oh, yes, I know that platform consists of an obvious reconciling and adjusting of divergent points of view within the Republican Party. If that were not true, then it would not have been the product, as it is, of democratic processes working within my party. If that were not true, then our Republican platform would be the product of machine politics, which it is not. We should recognize that if democratic processes are to function properly then political platforms, as well as legislation, must always be the result of fair compromises.

I am pleased to offer to this audience the 1948 Republican platform as a forward-looking, progressive statement not only of sound Republican principles, but also of a desirable political program for the United States for the next 4 years.

Of course, it is true that if it were left to my personal preference, I would modify some portions of that platform, and I would add other things to it which are not in it, such as a guaranty of civilian control of atomic energy developments.

However, in its entirety, I think our 1948 Republican platform is the most specific, progressive, and encouraging platform which any political party has offered to the American people in my lifetime. I think it clearly tells the death knell of the "old guard" Republican philosophy as the dominant viewpoint of the Republican Party. I think it is a platform within whose framework constitutional liberals can accomplish, by way of sound, progressive social legislation, what I consider to be one of the primary objectives of representative government.

I pause for a moment on that point because, as a constitutional liberal, I wish to emphasize to this audience what I consider to be the basic tenet of Republican constitutional liberalism.

I insist that a constitutional liberal must at all times seek to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong, but do it within the framework of a private-property economy and in keeping with the legal principles and guaranties of the Constitution, including its precious Bill of Rights.

I submit that the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia seeks through its statement of policies to attain that objective of constitutional liberalism.

Time does not permit any lengthy review in this speech of the Republican platform. However, I do point with pride to the fact that our platform this year is concise, refreshingly specific, and free of the weedy verbiage which so frequently characterizes political platforms.

I do wish to comment briefly on a few sections of the platform. I think the preamble of the platform which takes the form of a declaration of principles is a statement of objectives of representative government worthy of study in every civics classroom of America. I think this declaration of principles sets the entire tone and progressive outlook of the platform. Permit me to quote a paragraph or two from it:

"To establish and maintain peace, to build a country in which every citizen can earn a good living with the promise of real progress for himself and his family and to uphold as a beacon light for mankind everywhere the inspiring American tradition of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all—that is the Republican platform.

"To this end we propose as a guide to definite action the following principles:

"Maximum voluntary cooperation between citizens and minimum dependence on law; never, however, declining courageous recourse to law if necessary.

"Our competitive system furnishes vital opportunity for youth and for all enterprising citizens; it makes possible the productive power which is the unique weapon of our national defense, and is the mainspring of material well-being and political freedom.

"Government, as a servant of such a system, should take all needed steps to strengthen and develop public health, to promote scientific research, to provide security for the aged, and to promote a stable economy so that men and women need not fear the loss of their jobs or the threat of economic hardships through no fault of their own.

"Our foreign policy is dedicated to preserving a free America in a free world of free men. This calls for strengthening the United Nations and primary recognition of America's self-interest in the liberty of other

peoples. Prudently conserving our own resources, we shall cooperate on a self-help basis with other peace-loving nations.

"Constant and effective insistence on the personal dignity of the individual and his right to complete justice without regard to race, creed, or color, is a fundamental American principle."

The platform then proceeds to commit my party to support a progressive stand on labor's rights, soil conservation, reclamation, power development, flood control, government finances, inflation, housing, veterans' care, civil rights, old-age benefits, and the other major domestic issues which we all know must be faced and solved by the adoption of progressive measures in the next and future Congresses.

The plank on education states, "We favor equality of educational opportunity for all and the promotion of education and educational facilities."

This plank is not as specific as I, and probably many of you, would write it.

However, I interpret it as an approval of the principle of Federal aid to education because I think it is clear that we cannot obtain the objective of equality of educational opportunity for all, to use the language of the platform, without the Federal Government supplying some financial support to those localities in the country which cannot finance those minimum standards of educational opportunity which good citizenship training requires for all of our boys and girls.

The last section of the platform deals with the issue which supersedes in importance all other issues confronting us.

It is the issue of international policy and the course we follow on that issue will determine not only whether we have peace or war but also will determine the form of our survival in the history of nations.

Shall we continue to fulfill our true destiny as a Government of free people capable of being the leading force in establishing a world order of peace; or shall we permit the trials, tribulations, and international exasperations of the moment to cause us to make one or both of two serious mistakes which powerful forces in this country seem bent on our making? There is no denying the fact that there are those in this country who would have us meet the international crisis which faces us by adopting a policy of blind nationalism and a program of isolationism which characterized our international policy for almost 20 years before Pearl Harbor.

Senator THOMAS and I, who have served in the Senate these past few years, know something about the power and influence of the isolationist forces in this country. They are not limited just to my party. However, I am willing to confess that since 1920 my party has been seriously jeopardized by the forces of isolationism. Nevertheless, during the past 3 years a clear majority of the Republicans in the Congress have demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the international views of Wendell Willkie of 1940, Thomas Dewey of 1944, and of that great giant of the Senate, ARTHUR VANDENBERG have become the foreign-policy views of the Republican Party.

However, if there was so much as a lingering doubt about the repudiation of isolationism by the Republican Party, the platform on international policy which my party adopted in Philadelphia at our recent convention makes crystal clear that the foreign policy of our Government under a Republican administration will be based upon the recognition that my party is dedicated to the principle that we believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of international justice through law.

There is another force at work in America which I think jeopardizes peace and freedom in the world as much as does blind nationalism. It is represented by the attitude of

those who seem to think that we can win the peace by dictating the terms of peace.

Do not misunderstand me. I am unalterably opposed to adopting an appeasement policy in negotiations with Russia. I strongly favor building up our national defenses so that in a moment's notice we can defend and enforce the peace if Russia should persist upon a policy of aggressive action against the rights of free men in a freedom-seeking world.

Thus, as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and in the face of much criticism, I worked for and supported what I considered to be the most fair and adequate military defense legislation which could be passed in the last session of Congress.

As a member of that Armed Services Committee, I have not blinded myself to the fact that it is of vital importance that we make perfectly clear to the world, including Russia, that we seek a justiciable settlement of all international issues through the peaceful procedures of the United Nations rather than by resorting to force.

I think that Members of the Congress, particularly those of us who serve either on the Armed Services Committees or on the Foreign Relations Committees, should be forthright enough to tell the American people that we are satisfied, on the basis of our knowledge of the facts which have come to us as members of those committees, that the only victor of a third world war, no matter how soon it might come, would be the victory of chaos.

If we should be forced into that war, then I want my country as prepared as it can be to defend our people and save as much for them for the future as is humanly possible. However, let us not forget that a third world war would bring unthinkable destruction and human suffering upon all nation participants. In fact, I do not see how there can be any innocent bystanders in another war.

Granted that we could win a military victory, but a bloody and costly one, over any nation or group of nations which might decide to wage war against us, I think the realistic fact is inescapable that what you and I enjoy as the American way of life with all of its freedoms and economic advantages would disappear from our country for many generations to come.

I say that because I think a third world war would result in a complete regimentation of our American life and in the complete bankruptcy of our economy.

Every other nation, including Russia, knows that a similar fate would be visited upon it. Therefore, I think the challenge of world statesmanship today calls upon the people and the leaders of the United States to check the trend toward war.

It is not as a partisan that I express this conviction, but it is my firm belief that a change of administration in November is of paramount importance from the standpoint of our international problems, because it would permit of a new approach to our international problems by new leaders who are not handicapped by past mistakes.

In saying that, I do not criticize anyone for mistakes which may have been made in some of our international negotiations. Mistakes would have been made if a Republican administration had been in control of the White House during the many international crises which have confronted us since Pearl Harbor. It is not fair nor right for us to ask the American people in this campaign to look through their hind-sights at the mistakes which have been made and on the basis of those mistakes ask for the election of a Republican President, Vice President, and Congress.

It is not on that partisan basis that I stress the importance of a Republican victory but I do point out that we cannot escape the realities of the situation and therefore I

think that a new administration, with new leaders, can best profit from the mistakes on international issues which have been made and can best assure the American people that there is still a chance of winning the peace and of averting war.

I think my party in its Philadelphia platform has laid down a program of international policy which recommends itself to all Americans. I shall not read it all, but I do wish to emphasize the following three paragraphs and I quote from the platform:

"We dedicate our foreign policy to the preservation of a free America in a free world of free men. With neither malice nor desire for conquest, we shall strive for a just peace with all nations.

"We believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of justice and freedom. We shall support the United Nations as the world's best hope in this direction, striving to strengthen it and promote its effective evolution and use. The United Nations should progressively establish international law, be freed of any veto in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and be provided with the armed forces contemplated by the Charter.

"We pledge that under a Republican administration all foreign commitments shall be made public and subject to constitutional ratification. We shall say what we mean and mean what we say. In all these things we shall primarily consult the national security and welfare of our own United States. In all of these things we shall welcome the world's cooperation. But in none of these things shall we surrender our ideals or our free institutions."

The Republican platform focuses attention on three points upon which I think the American people need to ponder.

First, we make clear that we are dedicated to a foreign policy which seeks to preserve a free America in a free world of free men. We recognize that we cannot turn America into a vacuum of freedom.

If personal liberty and the dignity of the individual, which are the essence of freedom, are to be ground under the heel of aggressive police states in other parts of the world, such freedoms will not for long endure in America.

Further, we recognize in our platform and are committed to the proposition that the United Nations should progressively establish international law.

I hold to the view that the peace will never be won until we put into practice and operation the provisions of the United Nations Charter which make available to the nations of the world international judicial processes for settling many of the disputes which are creating the frightening crises confronting us this very hour.

I refer specifically to the World Court provisions of the United Nations Charter. In July 1945 I succeeded in securing the passage through the Senate of the United States of a resolution committing our Government to the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in respect to all international disputes covered by article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, which statute was made a part of the United Nations Charter.

My resolution at first was met with tactics of delay and opposition in the Senate but with the assistance of such forward-looking Senators as Senator THOMAS of Utah, who is associated with me on this program tonight, we were able to secure the adoption of my resolution committing our Government to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in cases of international disputes in which an opposing nation had likewise accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

It is to be regretted that Russia is the only great power in the world today who has not committed herself to the policy of submitting international disputes of the nature of

those covered by the World Court Charter to the World Court for decision.

However, the Republican platform recognizes the importance of our developing international law and I submit that since we signed the United Nations Charter, we have not exercised the leadership which we should have exercised in offering to submit many of our differences with Russia to the processes of international law provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Take, for example, the issue over Berlin. It would appear that at least on the surface Russia seeks to justify her position on alleged commitments on the part of the United States and Great Britain at Potsdam and possibly on commitments which our representatives are alleged to have made at Yalta.

The people of the United States, yes, the people of the world, are entitled, in the interest of peace, to have such an issue settled by international judicial processes rather than by the rattling of military forces.

Listen to what article 36 of the statute of the World Court, a part of the United Nations Charter, provides:

"1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

"2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

"4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

"5. Declarations made under article 36 of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

"6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

Certainly the issues of Berlin fall within the provisions of the World Court section of the UN if all countries to the dispute would agree to submit the Berlin issue to the World Court for decision.

It is true that Russia might refuse but I think our Government should give her a chance to accept. In fact, I think that many of the differences between Russia and the United States should be submitted to the World Court for judicial determination because many of them involve justiciable issues, particularly suited to settlement by an international judicial tribunal.

If Russia should persist in making her own interpretations and decisions as to what the Yalta, Potsdam, and other agreements mean and persists in resorting to force in an attempt to have her own way, then we must continue to prepare ourselves to meet that type of challenge to the world's peace.

At the same time, I think we should do all that we can to carry out the promise of the Republican platform to progressively estab-

lish international law as an instrument for solving our international disputes.

Further, let me point out that the pledge of the Republican platform that all foreign commitments should be made public and subject to constitutional ratification is of utmost importance to the development of a sound foreign policy.

I do not see how there can be any denying nor ignoring the fact that in recent years too many international agreements and understandings have been reached by the executive branch of our Government without the knowledge of the Congress of the United States or of the people of the country. Woodrow Wilson's clarion call for open covenants openly arrived at, which won universal approval of all of our people, has become but an echo of history in American foreign policy in recent years.

My party in its platform proposes to re-establish the check-and-balance feature of the Constitution in respect to international agreements and proposes to resolve all doubts in favor of the treaty-making procedures rather than resort to the legalistic defense which has been used as justification for the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, for example, without submitting them to the Senate for ratification.

Thus, I conclude my discussion of the issues raised by the Republican platform by expressing the conviction that the progressive approach to our many problems, domestic and international, pledged by that platform, recommends a Republican victory in November.

In closing I would advise the politicians of both parties to remember that the forces of political education, the impact upon our people of world events with all their implications for the future, the strains and stresses of our complex living problems and the fears and sense of insecurity that gnaw at the hearts of most Americans these days, leave little patience for political platitudes.

It is solutions to specific problems and issues which the American people want from their politicians. It is less politics and more statesmanship which the people want. It is an exercise of honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as they present themselves on specific issues that the American people want from their politicians. It is cause to effect reasoning rather than buck-passing ability and rationalization which the people want.

They are sick and tired of being told that depressions are part of the price we pay for liberty because they know it need not be so if more politicians would represent the people rather than have so many represent special interests which are still powerful enough in America to elect many men to office. The people know that there is no excuse for so many millions of our homeless being priced out of owning a home or being forced to pay triple prices for shacks that frequently are not so well constructed as chicken houses on a modern poultry farm. They know that the inflation boom which has turned the American dollar into a 50-cent piece, based on 1939 values, could have been and still could be checked in part by a Congress willing to recognize that free enterprise does not mean license for the owners of capital and sources of production to profiteer at the expense of the many as the result of a short supply created by an unbalanced war economy.

The people are disturbed by the encroachments upon inalienable rights set forth in the Constitution by powerful economic interests which are able to force through the Congress laws which transgress those rights. The people are beginning to see that many politicians are rationalizing legislation which invades the realm of inalienable rights by trying to convince the American people that the economic welfare of the country, the complex industrial system of the country, the material comforts of the country, the

uninterrupted production of the country justify and make reasonable a limiting of inalienable rights.

This materialistic approach to democracy is creating great tensions in our body politic. Many people are disturbed. Resentment is growing. All is not well in our democracy. Politicians and our political parties need to take heed of the fact that as the American people have risen in defense of inalienable human rights embodied in the spiritual values of democracy as epitomized in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution when those rights were endangered by totalitarianism abroad, so, too, will they in due course of time repudiate any attempt to transgress those rights through government by the privileged few at home.

We are witnessing in America today a resurgence of Hamiltonianism and a suppression of Jeffersonianism. It is not surprising that economic dislocations, inflationary prices, failure as yet to win the peace, labor excesses, monopolistic profiteering, inequitable taxes, Russian aggression, growing class-conscious conflicts at home and abroad, the danger of another war, and the on-every-hand manifestations of greed and selfishness have left the average voter perplexed, disillusioned, and sick at heart over politics and politicians.

Our politicians will discover that the American people will never endure any form of economic fascism or any form of communism, because the people know that economic fascism, even by big business, and any form of communism, even by a class-conscious third party in America, will mean the end to personal liberty. The Lincoln view of the superiority of human rights over property rights is no political cliché in our American ideology of representative self-government. Any sacrifice of individual freedom to the economic advantage of the owners of property or to the economic comfort of the general public strikes at the roots of the inalienable personal rights set forth in our Constitution.

We cannot have those rights and eat them, too. We cannot respect them only when it is economically advantageous to do so and still preserve them. Lip service of praise for individual liberty, followed by legislation which sets forth procedures so restrictive in nature as to make effective exercise of individual liberty impossible, will never check encroachments upon the democratic way of life.

I think that in America today there is being renewed a struggle between Hamiltonian theories of political aristocracy and Jeffersonian theories of human rights; between the static constitution of John Marshall and the dynamic constitution of Holmes and Brandeis; between the exploitation of our people by a laissez faire economy and the paramount duty of a representative government to promote the general welfare by protecting the weak from the exploitation of the strong.

I like to put my view as to the trend in American politics, as I see that trend, in terms of a fight being waged by constitutional liberals on the one hand and political reactionaries and leftists on the other side. My definition of a constitutional liberal is a person who believes in applying the guarantees and legal principles of the Constitution to human rights and property rights in America. He is a person who believes in the good old Lincoln doctrine that we can best protect property rights by first protecting human rights.

A constitutional liberal recognizes that the ideology of communism cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our Constitution because the dignity of the individual, the inalienable rights guaranteed to the individual by our Constitution, and the right to exercise a freedom of choice through a free ballot box in determining one's political des-

tiny are all foreign to the ideology of communism.

The constitutional liberal asks the American people these days never to forget that the police state methods of communism, the totalitarianism of communism, and the principle of master rule by the state, on which communism is based, cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our American Constitution.

I invite all forward-looking citizens to join with Republican constitutional liberals in opposing at every turn the political tactics of the communistic ideology as represented by the Wallace party movement in America. I urge all forward-looking Americans to join with Republican constitutional liberals in gaining a Republican victory in November 1948, so that we can start putting into effect the sound, forward-looking, progressive platform which my party adopted at its historic Philadelphia convention.

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I omitted mentioning an item a while ago. In yesterday's Washington Post there was printed a brief article entitled "Extra Session Score Card," giving the present status of legislation recommended by the President, indicating which bills have passed the House, which have passed the Senate, and whether hearings have been held upon any of them. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

The White House yesterday issued what is called a score card for special session. It noted that "the legislation urged upon the Congress by the President is in various stages" and then gave this listing:

	Passed Senate	Favorably reported by House committee	Hearings held by this or previous Congress
1. Anti-inflation program.	No.....	No.....	Yes.
2. Housing bill.....	Yes.....	Yes.....	Yes.
3. Federal aid to education.	Yes.....	No.....	Yes.
4. Increase minimum wage.	No.....	No.....	Yes.
5. Social security: Increase persons covered and amounts of benefit.	No.....	No ¹	Yes.
6. Reform of Federal pay scales.	No.....	No.....	Yes.
7. Civil rights program.	No.....	(²).....	Yes.
8. Correction of Displaced Persons Act.	No.....	No.....	Yes.
9. UN loan.....	Yes.....	Yes.....	Yes.
10. International wheat agreement.	No.....	(³).....	Yes.
11. Restoration of funds for power projects.	No.....	No.....	Yes.

¹ Inadequate bill has passed House.

² Anti-poll-tax bill has passed House; antilynching bill has been reported by House committee.

³ Does not require House action.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. Under the order of the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil

transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few moments ago asked unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the statement issued last night by the Republican leaders of the Congress.

Paragraph 7 of that statement reads as follows:

According to present intentions, the program for the first week will include Senate consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill, already passed by the House, in order that there may be a proper opportunity for all to vote in the November election.

Mr. President, in that connection I desire to invite the attention of Senators to Senate Joint Resolution 132, introduced on May 19, 1944, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on behalf of himself and 34 other Senators. That resolution, the title of which is "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to removal of the requirement for payment of poll tax," reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State by reason of failure to pay a poll tax.

"Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The Senators who are now Members of the Senate and who joined with the Senator from Nebraska in the introduction of that resolution 4 years ago were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

There were then in the Senate nine other Senators who joined in the introduction of the resolution, who are not at

present Members of this body. They were former Senator Austin, of Vermont; former Senator Burton, of Ohio; the late Senator Davis, of Pennsylvania; the late Senator Johnson, of California; former Senator Nye, of North Dakota; former Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota; the late Senator Thomas, of Idaho; former Senator Weeks, of Massachusetts; and former Senator Willis, of Indiana.

The joint resolution was introduced on May 19, 1944. The Republican National Convention met at Chicago, and, on June 28, 1944, adopted this plank in its platform:

ANTI POLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

It is significant that the Republican convention adopted the same idea that the Senators did here, for undoubtedly many of them were present at the convention and asked that the problem be solved in that way.

When the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration had under consideration House bill 29, making unlawful the requirement of a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote in primary or other elections, I submitted my individual views as to what should be done. The Senate will find my statement in the binder which is on the desks of all Senators. I pointed out in the statement that during the past 6 years the House of Representatives had four times passed an anti-poll-tax bill by more than a two-thirds majority. I also pointed out that in order to obtain consideration of a poll-tax bill in the Senate the adoption of a cloture rule would in all probability be required, which likewise would require a two-thirds majority vote. I expressed the opinion that it would be very much easier to obtain the adoption of a constitutional amendment under a cloture procedure than it would be to obtain consideration of a bill which many Senators believed to be unconstitutional.

I shall not go back over the record, but there will undoubtedly be quoted in the course of time many Republican Senators, some of whom are now Members of the Senate, who sincerely believe that the bill as it passed the House of Representatives violates the Constitution of the United States.

In order to obtain cloture, in order to get the required two-thirds vote in the Senate to have the subject brought under consideration, it will make a good deal of difference to Senators to know what kind of a measure they will be asked to vote for. There are Senators who will not vote for cloture under any circumstances. They are opposed on principle to restricting debate. There are others who will vote for cloture even though they expect to vote against the bill. But the majority of Senators believe that they should favor a measure before they vote to close debate upon it.

I am quite confident that it would be much more feasible to propose a measure to amend the Constitution of the United States than to bring a bill before the Senate proposing to enact a law which many Senators believe would be unconstitutional. Therefore, I want to sug-

gest to the Republican leadership that if they intend to bring forward a poll-tax bill and are anxious to get action upon it, if there can be a gentlemen's agreement that all after the enacting clause of the House bill shall be stricken out and provision for a constitutional amendment, such as was proposed heretofore, shall be substituted, I think that will expedite the consideration of the bill in this body. That is my judgment, based upon long service in the Senate. I have been credited with having some know-how with regard to getting bills through the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. If a constitutional amendment were adopted, it would require ratification by three-fourths of the States, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

I pointed out in my report, Mr. President, how quickly the equal suffrage amendment was adopted. It was adopted by 36 State legislatures within 15 months after Congress submitted the amendment to the States and became a part of the Constitution of the United States. It vitally changed the Constitution and the laws of 29 States in which women were not theretofore permitted to vote.

There are only seven States of the Union today where the poll tax applies, and I confidently predicted in the report—and I believe it to be true—that if a constitutional amendment on the question of the abolition of the poll tax were submitted to the States, it would be ratified in even a shorter time than was the case with respect to the equal-suffrage amendment. At the elections next November the members of the legislatures of practically all the States in the Union will be elected, and the legislatures will be in session in January and February. If a constitutional amendment is now submitted to the States, I predict it will not be a year before it will be ratified. That is why I think it is wise to take the action I have suggested.

Six years have been wasted in dealing with the poll-tax question. The House of Representatives, as I have stated, four times within the past 6 years has passed an anti-poll-tax bill by a majority of more than two-thirds, and there is no question that if the Senate strikes out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitutes a provision for a constitutional amendment, the House would adopt it, and that would be the end of the controversy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona if the constitutional amendment procedure were followed rather than consideration of the bill which is on the Senate Calendar, is he in any position to give assurance that the constitutional amendment would not be subject to filibuster?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not conferred with other Senators in regard to that matter. We all know that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to end a filibuster, if cloture is to be applied, and

I am sure there will be much less difficulty in getting a two-thirds vote if the question is on the submission of a constitutional amendment than if it is on the question of agreeing to a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional. That is simply common sense. I, myself, would not vote for cloture to bring the House bill before the Senate, but I would vote for cloture to bring a constitutional amendment before the Senate, and I know there are other Senators who feel exactly the same way about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any assurance that the House of Representatives would vote for a constitutional amendment of the kind he suggests?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that by a two-thirds vote on four different occasions the House has passed a bill which did not involve the question of a constitutional amendment. With that record, it seems to me no Member of the House should object to referring a proposed amendment to the State legislatures, letting them settle the poll-tax question, exactly as they did the question of woman's suffrage.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not made a recent canvass in regard to the matter, has he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not made a canvass either in the Senate or in the House. I am submitting my suggestion for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator speaks of a two-thirds vote to get cloture. Does the Senator agree with me that even if we got cloture on the constitutional amendment to which the Senator referred, that would not stop a filibuster in the Senate? I asked that because of the fact that under existing rule XXII a filibuster may proceed on other items which are not considered measures under the existing rule of the Senate, such, for example, as the approval of the Journal. Therefore the filibuster could proceed on some other item, even though it might be possible to secure cloture on the particular proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that the Senator is mistaken about that. If the Senate votes cloture, then each Senator is limited to 1 hour, and when all who desire to speak have concluded, the Senate votes. It has been the experience in the Senate with respect to cloture that after debate was closed the pending measure was passed in a very reasonable time. The difficulty is in getting the Senate in a position where it can vote for cloture.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has nothing to do with a two-thirds vote. It merely has to do with the present state of the rules. As I pointed out in another report I made from the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the present time there is no limitation upon debate with respect to the approval of the Journal, and there is no limitation on debate

on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. But once the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of a bill, then a cloture petition can be filed, and when it is filed, and two-thirds vote to close debate, debate is closed.

Mr. MORSE. That suggests the hypothetical question I wished to put to the Senator from Arizona, because I think there is great public misunderstanding throughout the country, as of this hour, as to the possibility of preventing a filibuster in this special session of the Congress. I think the President of the United States labors under the same misapprehension, if I read his statement correctly.

As the Senate rules now exist, a filibuster could be conducted, for example, on the Journal. I noticed that at the beginning of the session today the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] reserved the right to object to a unanimous consent request for approving the Journal. Before he would agree to a unanimous consent agreement to approve the Journal he sought to ascertain what the procedure was going to be on the part of the majority party in the Senate for the rest of the day. I assume the Senator had in mind that if today, for example, a motion was to be brought up making the poll tax the order of business it was the intention of the Senator from Georgia to proceed to discuss the Journal at some length. Under the existing rules of the Senate the Journal is not considered a measure within the rules. Therefore cloture would not apply to any motion to approve the Journal.

Until we can get over that parliamentary hump, the proposal of the Senator from Arizona—which on its face seems to be very plausible, I assure him—until we can get over that particular procedural hump, it seems to me it is foolish to talk about applying cloture to the proposed constitutional amendment upon which the Senator from Arizona comments.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator misunderstood me. I stated that in my opinion there would be no vote on an anti-poll-tax bill or anti-poll-tax amendment without the adoption of cloture, so far as I understand the situation in the Senate. As to the obstacles, I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon. There is no dispute about the status of the rules as they have been interpreted up to this time. But I do say that in order to apply cloture, a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required, and in my judgment I think it would be easier to get two-thirds of the Senators to apply a limitation of debate if there were a gentleman's agreement that what we were going to vote on would be a proposed constitutional amendment, and not a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since I have come to the Senate I have heard that the Sen-

ate can do almost anything by unanimous consent. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is optimistic enough to believe it might be possible to get unanimous consent to pass a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not ask unanimous consent. All I can say is that I have seen gentlemen's agreements carried out. There was one when the cloture rule we now have in effect was adopted. There was a long and determined filibuster in the Senate against a shipping bill at the close of a session of Congress. At the beginning of the following session the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus agreed that something should be done about the rules, and they adopted the present rule XXII. There was a gentleman's agreement that that rule as it was reported to the Senate would be adopted without change, and it was agreed that if any effort were made to change it, it would be voted down.

If a majority on the Republican side, particularly those who joined in the resolution that I have read to the Senate, will agree, there will not be any trouble about getting action, because they constitute the leadership of the Senate. Certainly if there can be an agreement that when the House bill comes before the Senate a majority of the Senate will support a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the proposal which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and 34 of his colleagues in the form of a constitutional amendment, the prospect for obtaining the required two-thirds vote for cloture will be vastly improved. Otherwise, I doubt if it will be possible to obtain a two-thirds vote.

Mr. MORSE. As the acting majority leader for the moment, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that the problem of a filibuster is a problem on his side of the aisle. Therefore before he makes his proposal to the Republican leadership he should bring to us from his side of the aisle a definite agreement as to the terms and conditions under which a filibuster would not proceed. Until we have such a proposal I do not see how the Senator from Arizona can expect the Republican side of the aisle to proceed with his suggestion. I think it is up to the Democratic side of the aisle to enter into a gentleman's agreement among themselves as to the terms and conditions under which they will proceed to give consideration to a poll-tax measure, whether it be by way of a bill or by way of the Senator's proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has very kindly asked me to assume a position of leadership on my side, which I have no intention of doing. All I am trying to do is to give the Senator the benefit of some advice that is based upon my experience in the Senate, and to get things done. I have been complimented at different times on the fact that I had the know-how. Now I am giving the Senator some of that know-how. I am trying to tell the Senator that it would be easier, it would be less difficult, and just as effective to propose a constitutional amendment as it would be to un-

dertake to try to pass the House bill. If the Senator does not care to accept this gratuitous advice of mine, very well. Nobody is compelling him to do that. I am not now making any bargain with the Senator concerning what we can do or will do. I am simply saying that it will be the part of wisdom for the Republican majority to adopt a course which will secure for them the most votes, if they want some action at this session of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arizona knows the extremely high regard in which I hold him, and I do appreciate his advice so far as it applies to me and my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle.

In a real sense, however, the opinion of my good friend from Arizona amounts to passing the buck on this issue from the Democratic side of the aisle to the Republican side of the aisle, whereas the real cause of the deadlock on this issue is to be found in the fact that we have not up to date been able to proceed with poll-tax legislation either in the form of a constitutional amendment or by a bill, because of the constant threatened filibuster on the Democratic side of the aisle. Therefore I think it is not unreasonable for the Republican side of the aisle to make the suggestion which the junior Senator from Oregon has made to the Senator from Arizona, namely, that it is up to the Democratic leaders to come forward and present to us on the Republican side of the aisle a gentleman's agreement proposing the terms and conditions which the Democrats wish to offer for consideration of poll-tax legislation. Such a proposal should make perfectly clear that if we accept it there will not be any filibuster on the issue or if there is that a sufficient number of Democrats will join with us in applying a rule of cloture. To accomplish that result it may be necessary to change the Senate rule on cloture in order to include within the rule all matters of business such as a request for approval of the Journal. As I have already pointed out, the present rule XXII makes it impossible to apply cloture to debate on the Journal because it has been held that consideration of the Journal is not within the term "measure" as that term is used in rule XXII governing cloture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I did not get on my feet with any intention of "passing the buck." On the contrary I will not take the "buck" he has attempted to pass to me, and pass it along.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. First, the ultimate purpose is to abolish the poll tax.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Those who are in favor of abolishing the poll tax, as I understand, are very much concerned over the fact that if it is to be done by constitutional amendment—I do not think it has to be done in that manner, although I would be perfectly willing to vote for such an amendment—13 States can prevent the adoption of a constitutional amendment, although two-thirds or three-fourths of the people may be in favor

of it. Still 13 States can block the adoption of such an amendment. It is said that perhaps they will not do so. I should like to have first the Senator's opinion as to whether the Legislature of the State of Arizona would be likely to adopt such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure they would. The State of Arizona had a poll tax in effect for a number of years and decided that it was not in the public interest to continue it, and so did away with it.

Mr. TAFT. Since it is proposed to place a limitation of States' rights upon other States, would there not be a different feeling on the part of the individual States? That is the problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is no more so than the constitutional amendment dealing with the right of women to vote. Exactly the same argument could be made with respect to whether women should vote. Prior to the adoption of the constitutional amendment, that was a matter which each State determined for itself. But the Congress decided that women should be allowed to vote in all States, and the amendment was submitted and very promptly adopted. Although, as I said, there were 29 States in which women were not permitted to vote, yet they adopted the constitutional amendment within 15 months.

In this case there are only seven States in which the poll tax prevails.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the constitutional amendment method is the way to go about it, and always the Senator would have in reserve and could come back to, if there was a failure to adopt the constitutional amendment, the method which has been fooled with for many years, a method which to my mind will prove absolutely ineffectual at this session of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator is arguing about cloture, does the Senator think it will be any easier to adopt a motion to take up a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly, because in the case of the constitutional amendment, I know that Senators who feel as I do and think that the constitutional amendment method is the one to adopt would vote for a motion to consider a measure proposing a constitutional amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The question is not one of voting after a motion to take up is adopted. The question is whether we can ever reach a vote on the motion to take up. Can the Senator from Arizona give us assurance that we can more easily reach a motion to take up a measure proposing a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I have been saying all afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any assurance on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know is how I feel about it and how many other Senators feel. I have heard Senators frankly say that they would battle to the last against the Congress invading by law the right of the States to regulate voting within their borders. On the other hand

I have heard them say that they had no objection to submitting the question to the States by way of constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am, of course, not authorized nor would I presume to speak for the Democratic side on this matter. I will say, however, that this phase of the subject has been discussed in conferences which have been held by those who sit on this side of the aisle who are opposing, or proposing to oppose to the limit of our ability this statutory poll-tax measure as well as all bills labeled civil rights which invade the rights of the sovereign States. In my judgment there would be no long-drawn-out discussion in the Senate of the United States on a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to the people and to the States to eliminate a poll tax if those of us who are opposed to the statutory bill can have clear and definite assurance that the Senate would stand fast to its position in proposing this matter to the people and to the States through a constitutional amendment and against any effort to deal with it by statute.

There is a very common error which has been carefully generated in the minds of the people of the Nation with respect to our position on this bill. Through the insidious propaganda that brought this issue into being, started when it was born, and which has been constantly spread since that time, the matter of the poll tax as a tax has been magnified all out of proportion to its real importance. We here are not undertaking to defend the poll tax as such. My own State has no poll tax, and I am glad that it does not. There are those who have said that they think the tax was an onerous burden on the right to vote. I have never been able to endorse that statement.

The poll tax in my State was \$1 a year—less than 2 cents a week. In this day of high State taxes and Federal taxes, when people say that a poll tax of a dollar a year is an onerous burden on the rights of a man to vote, such argument is to me sheer political poppycock. But it is an outmoded tax or method of raising revenue. I know of but one Member of the Senate who believes in the poll tax as such, and he believes in it for the purpose of the identification of the voter, and that is a very sound reason.

Mr. President, we do propose to use every parliamentary device available to us to assure us ample time to let the people of the Nation know what is really behind all this agitation for statutory repeal of the poll tax. We propose to use all the time that is necessary and available to us under any rule of the Senate to let the American people know all the implications inherent in the legislation. We will endeavor to bring to every citizen of the United States the knowledge and the awareness of the fact that if the Congress of the United States has a right by a simple statute to in effect repeal sections of the Constitution and wipe out a poll tax within a sovereign State by statute, it has a right to pass a bill to federalize all elections for all Federal officials. We propose to take the time necessary to let every person, even though

he be a wayfaring individual, know that if the Congress has the right to pass this anti-poll-tax bill as a statute, it can and is likely to pass legislation that will put a little Federal agent, and a United States marshal, at every voting precinct in this land.

This is a fight to preserve the rights of the several States to handle their own elections without dictation from Washington, and the laws of seven States retaining the poll tax is merely incidental.

In this day of restless change, in this day of subversive activity, in this period when those in the Kremlin seem to have seized upon or created a political party in this country to use for their purposes, let Senators ponder whether or not they wish to have the power over elections concentrated in the central government in Washington. If this Nation were to come under the domination of some unscrupulous and ruthless President, Congress could easily pass a bill to take over the election machinery of the States and control elections from Washington. Let Senators consider how long the liberties of the people would survive under such circumstances.

It is ironical to have this bill brought forward in the guise of civil rights. It is a bill to take the control of elections from the State capitals, from the counties of the States and from the local precincts within the counties and federalize them. Such a course would toss into the laps of the gods every right of every American citizen.

Those who say that we are fighting to retain a tax of \$1 are either closing their eyes or deliberately distorting the issue before the American people. We are fighting to retain in the several States the power over elections. This right of the several States was never challenged by anyone anywhere until a few years ago. I think I am correct in saying that the agitation to repeal the poll-tax laws of States by the Federal Congress was started by the Daily Worker. It is not a question of collecting a dollar poll tax even though the poll tax is the oldest of all taxes. Some seem to think that the word "poll" relates to the voting place in the precinct. It is from an old Anglo-Saxon word. It means a head tax. We are not defending the poll tax as such. We are defending the right of the States to govern their own elections and to keep Federal police and the Federal Government away from the voting places in the local precincts now operated under State laws.

If we can be given assurance that this matter will be proposed in the form of a constitutional amendment, I am sure that there will be no great difficulty in submitting such an amendment to the people of the United States. If Congress falls for this political claptrap and tries to enact such a law in the form of a statute, we shall resist it on this floor so long as we have the power and the right to do so. Some of us believe that we know our rights on the floor of the Senate.

I am glad to have the opportunity to make clear to the Senate our position on this question. Usually the attendance in the Senate is not good when one of these misnamed civil-rights bills is

brought up for consideration. The day before a measure of this kind is brought up, the headlines usually say, "Filibuster threatens in the Senate," and Senators betake themselves to the corridors, their offices, or some place other than the Senate Chamber.

Southern Senators have never fought over the \$1 tax as such. We are fighting for the right to control our own elections in our own States. It is not merely a fight for Southern States. It is just as important to every American, whether he lives in Oregon, New York, or Michigan, as it is to a citizen of a Southern State. It is important to retain in each State the right to control elections if we are to protect our people and our form of government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia. The Constitution provides that Congress may regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections; and it has frequently done so. There may be a constitutional question involved in the meaning of the word "qualification," but so far as the manner of conducting elections is concerned, the Constitution gives Congress the right to regulate it, and it has frequently done so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Ohio does not appreciate the weight of a precedent in the Congress, it is the only obvious thing I have ever seen that he could not understand.

It is proposed to create a precedent by telling the States what the qualifications of voters shall be. It is easy to follow that precedent with a bill to Federalize elections. We do not propose to submit to any such policy so long as we can resist it.

If we can have assurances that a constitutional amendment will be sustained by the Senate to the end, and that we shall not be compelled in conference to accept a statute, I think we can dispose of the question in short order. There will be some discussion. There will be no unanimous vote, but there will certainly be no prolonged debate, and the discussion will not require an unusual length of time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I made these remarks without consulting any other Member of the Senate as to what I intended to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit I wish to say that I had no idea that he would make any statement on this subject today.

Mr. HAYDEN. Other Senators will confirm my statement. I was simply trying to arrive at a method whereby the same result could be accomplished that is desired by those who sponsored the joint resolution which I have read without the great difficulty which I know would be experienced if we attempted to enact a statute. Inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and a group of 25 or more of his associates in the Senate sponsored a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, if they will stand by what they proposed in 1944 I am sure that they can get

enough help from Republican Senators to give the assurance which the Senator from Georgia has asked.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wished to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that article IV, section 4, of the Constitution provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government. The Constitution even spells "Republican" with a capital R, which is very impressive. So, in addition to what the Senator has said, there are further guarantees as to the form of government and as to the protection of the Federal Constitution. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona, recognizing the respect, if not reverence, in which we hold him, will still wish us to examine this proposal to determine whether or not it may be a Trojan donkey which is being presented for our consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be brought out that many eminent Republicans, including some of the most able lawyers who have ever served in this body, have said that this kind of bill is unconstitutional. The same view is held by Members of the House. I remember particularly a Member of the House from Maine, when I was a Member of that body, who made a very able argument to the effect that such a bill was unconstitutional, and that he would not support it. Senator Borah and other lawyers took the same position.

There are two sides to the question. It is clear, however, that if the Constitution were amended the question would be settled. It would not be necessary to go to the Supreme Court to have a determination as to whether or not the law which we passed was constitutional. A constitutional amendment would settle that question.

I am satisfied that it would be easier to get the required two-thirds vote—which will be necessary in any event—for a constitutional amendment than for a bill. For that reason, as a practical matter, hoping to see something accomplished, I have made these few remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make a brief observation. I am one of those who favor the abolition of the poll tax by the States, if possible, and by the Federal Government if we must.

I was the introducer, in 1941, of the original bill on this subject. That bill was amended in the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a subcommittee headed by one of the greatest Senators and one of the best Americans who ever sat in this body, Hon. George Norris, of Nebraska. The bill applied to primary as well as special and general elections.

No one esteems more highly than I do my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I know, of course, that he did not intend to include his colleagues in his reference to the Daily Worker. I introduced that bill because I believed in the principle. The Daily Worker had nothing to do with it. I introduced the bill because of my honest sentiments and conscientious beliefs. I

have spoken in this body for it, and I have defended it on the platform. It has been before my constituents in elections ever since 1941.

While I regret that I am the only Senator from any of the 11 Southern States who feels as I do, I have as much right to a conscientious feeling and to my convictions as has anyone else to take the contrary position, which right I do not question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware that the Senator drafted the bill which passed the House and was considered in the Senate 6 years ago. A similar bill has been before the Senate on four occasions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is what I am coming to: I believe in this bill. If this statutory method, which I believe to be legally and constitutionally possible, is the only way of getting the poll tax abolished, and is the only way of enfranchising, as a practical matter, the citizens of this country who are practically disfranchised because of the poll tax, then I am in favor of having this Congress exercise its power to strike down that disfranchisement.

However, I wish to say that it is an unhappy thing to have the valuable and the worth-while legislation recommended in the President's message, which this country wants, delayed because of an unfortunate and sharp schism in the Senate over this particular measure or kindred measures. The other aspects of the civil-rights program I shall pass upon when I see the bills, and I shall vote in accordance with what I think is right at the time when the votes come, after seeing the legislation which I am to vote upon at that time.

But if we could have an agreement here that instead of pressing for the statutory repeal of the poll tax, we could with only short debate submit to the States a constitutional amendment for the abolition of the poll tax, without any litigation in the courts being necessary, the matter could be settled by the people. That would seem to me, taking everything into consideration at the present time, to be the best practical approach to the elimination of the poll tax.

I hope, therefore, the salutary suggestion made by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will prevail. I was glad to see the favorable response which was indicated on both sides of the aisle here today. Certainly if that suggestion, so ably and wisely made by the able Senator from Arizona, is not adopted, the majority party, which has control of the Senate Calendar, should not, with all these other recommendations for imperative legislation which were made by the President—for example, the passage of a minimum wage law, and so forth, bring up the anti-poll-tax bill, upon which opinion is so sharply divided, before consideration of high prices, housing, and so forth.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Florida. I

assume that he will be through in a moment, and then of course I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask a question now of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I shall be glad to respond to a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is this: If the proposed method is such a wonderful and salutary way of dealing with this problem, which has been before the Senate for so many years, I wonder why it was not followed by the Democrats when they had complete control of the situation in this body, as they did for such a long time. Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. PEPPER. It might be that at that time the Senators on the other side of the aisle were not prepared to acquiesce.

However that may be, the Senator will understand that today we are not trying to read history, but we are trying to make it. So if anyone is at fault, let him receive the condemnation which the Senator would like him to receive.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Florida will agree with me, I am sure, that so far as reaching the final result is concerned, the method of adopting a constitutional amendment will be just as effective as the method of passing a law on the subject.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated a while ago that if, without a bitter, acrimonious fight on this floor, inasmuch as Senators are deeply divided in conscientious sentiment on this subject, we could pass within a few hours, or certainly within a day or two, at the outside, the proposed constitutional amendment, and if the other body would acquiesce—and we would know that it either would or would not in a very short time—then the matter could be submitted at once to the several States. With the legislatures of the States meeting within 2 or 3 years at the outside, I believe the amendment would be soon adopted. So, taking everything into consideration, I believe that would be the wisest and most practical approach to the problem now. As the original introducer of this proposed legislation, I should like to see it favorably disposed of in some way which would avoid holding up all these other measures, such as high prices and the other proposals of the President, which the Congress should be considering at the present time, and at the same time would permit the making of some reasonable progress toward the abolition of the odious as well as obsolete poll tax.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to give his informal opinion, just as the Senator from Florida gave his informal opinion, in regard to the following question: If such a method were employed—in other words, the constitutional amendment method—and if such a constitutional amendment were adopted, what is his

opinion as to the action which might be taken by the State of Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my State has no poll tax. We have eliminated it. But I would not undertake to speak for the general assembly of my State. I have no power to bind it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. My assembly adopted a new constitution for the State of Georgia, and that constitution eliminated the poll tax, which was an inheritance from colonial days.

Let me say that I was much interested in the observation of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] about the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government to the States, inasmuch as the poll tax was in existence when the present Constitution and form of government was adopted and, as a matter of fact, before then. All of the Original Thirteen States had poll taxes or even more rigid property qualifications when they agreed to accept the Constitution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia is very well informed as to the feeling of the people of his State, of course. He has stated that the new constitution of the State of Georgia does not include provision for a poll tax. Let me ask whether it would be his opinion that in line with that precedent there would be a general feeling in Georgia in favor of the adoption of such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I am ever questioned about this statement, I wish this preface to appear: That I have no idea what the general assembly of Georgia would do on this question. If the assembly was not too hard pressed with local legislation I would guess the chances would be good that they would ratify such an amendment abolishing the poll tax.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, to the Senator from Georgia I would say that in my reference to the republican form of government I did not mean to convey any implication that that necessitated a poll tax or the elimination of it. I was, rather, addressing myself to the point that under the Federal Constitution the Federal Government has certain responsibilities in regard to the character of the Government, and might conceivably, under that responsibility, in the future, as it has in the past, exercise the power which the Senator felt was so objectionable, and I am inclined to agree with him as to the unfortunate consequences of the Federal Government intervening in local elections; but I am not of the opinion that the pending legislation on the poll tax will produce any serious violation of the general principle with which we are here concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course if there were a man who undertook to establish what was practically tantamount to a dictatorship within a State, I am sure that in such case the Federal Government owes some obligation to the citizens of such a State, who would be in danger of being oppressed by such a dictatorship; but certainly there is a great deal of difference between such a situation—an attempt by one man to proceed to destroy a republican form of government

in a State, to establish a virtual dictatorship in a single State, and action under an alleged power to regulate and control elections generally throughout the 48 States by the Federal Government. Such action would constitute a threat against the republican form of government of all 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is perfectly clear, as a result of this discussion, that Senators on this side of the aisle have been greatly impressed with the statements made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I respectfully suggest that it would appear that the next step in the consideration of this matter involves a formal offer by the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, which I assume could come following a discussion or conference among the Democrats, in regard to whether they wish to offer to the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle a proposal for a gentlemen's agreement in the form of a substitute for an anti-poll-tax bill. As acting majority leader I can give assurance that the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle would take under advisement such an offer.

It would also seem clear from the discussion today that in carrying out the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, assurance should be given by the Democratic side of the aisle that no prolonged debate in the form of a filibuster would accompany a proposal to substitute the submission of a proposed constitutional amendment on the poll tax for the pending bill on the same subject.

It seems to me that until such an offer is made and such assurances given by the duly elected officials of the Democratic organization in the Senate, there is no further progress that we can make on the subject at this time. As acting majority leader for the moment, I am privileged to say that the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle will take under advisement any proposal on the matter which Democratic Senators wish to offer.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is very kind of the Senator, but I think that the way to get together is for both sides to go to work. My suggestion is that there be conferences on the Republican side of the aisle to find out how many there are who would favor abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment; then perhaps we can talk together. An agreement does not have to be reached by exactly observing all the formalities. I have seen much business transacted in the Senate through understandings, by knowing just where we are and what is going to be done. It can be accomplished in that way. I offer this suggestion on my own initiative. I hope that it will bear some fruit.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator will follow it up with further conferences on his side of the aisle.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at the close of the last session of Congress

last month I indicated to the Senate certain reservations which I held with regard to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was approved at that time.

I was a member of the conference committee on Senate bill 2242, and I declined to sign the conference report, as a means of protesting against what I considered to be undesirable provisions of the bill.

At that time I announced that at the earliest opportunity I would urge amending legislation so that we might have a better law. Such an opportunity now presents itself in the form of a bill to amend the act of 1948, which bill I join with my colleagues, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY], in presenting at this time. The bill will change the cut-off date, in defining the eligibility of displaced persons who are now in camps in the American zones of Germany and Austria, from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947.

The purpose of the amendatory legislation is twofold. It removes a discriminatory feature that was unjustified in view of the humanitarian motives which inspired the legislation. It makes the act more workable, because the date of April 21, 1947, corresponds to the date on which complete records were first maintained as to the population of the displaced-persons camps. It therefore removes the possibility of fraudulent applications which would have been possible by reason of the incompleteness of registrations prior to April 21, 1947.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like briefly to discuss the bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate, and which happened to be the unfinished business at the previous session, with the hope that we may dispose of it this afternoon.

Mr. President, at the close of the last session, in the rather hectic hours, there came up for consideration a bill which had been under consideration by the Congress and by the constituted committees of the Congress, and by the presidential board, the measure dealing with our aviation position. The closing hours did not permit final consideration of it, as the unfinished business, before the session terminated; which I trust may commend itself to the Senate as a reason why it may be disposed of this afternoon, without doing violence to any other understandings which may subsequently be reached as to the program for this session.

Since the adjournment of the Senate, additional reasons have multiplied as to the very great desirability of this proposed legislation. The situation in Berlin today, where we are seeking to transport by air all commodities essential to the maintenance of our position, may subsequently be vitally involved in the very measure here proposed, which deals exclusively with the further development of our air transport.

At the present time, undoubtedly American aviation enjoys a supreme position in the world so far as civil air transport is concerned, and, we trust and believe, so far as military aviation is concerned. I think I can say, however, without the possibility of successful contradiction, that that situation cannot continue unless we shall without delay take action of the character here contemplated. Not only is the situation in Berlin today a dramatic illustration of the vital character of civilian air transport, but also, within the past week, a foreign country, entirely through the medium of governmental subsidy, a governmental subsidy indirectly resulting in large measure from the grants of funds from our own Treasury, has completed for trial and test a jet air transport, which, day before yesterday, flew from London to Paris in 30 minutes. That would mean that, in the course of time it could in 5 hours cross the Atlantic, and that would mean that unless America takes action of some character to meet this challenge within the next 2 or 3 years the entire progress of American aviation may find itself stalled by the failure to develop new types of planes.

We have thus far maintained supremacy in air transport by the ingenuity and the organization of our own aircraft industry. It was the unanimous testimony of everyone concerned in aircraft and in air lines, and of every authority in our Government, who are in concurrence, that that situation has now reached an absolute impasse as a result of the cost of development.

To develop today a new type of aircraft, which is urgently needed, requires an expense of from \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000. To get back the money from such development, 300 planes must be sold. There is no prospect whatever at the present time that any individual aircraft manufacturer would undertake the hazards which are involved. Therefore, as the result of studies of the past year made by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, which is in complete and unanimous concurrence, and by the Presidential Aviation Policy Board, which was similarly unanimous, and as the result of the concurrence of every agency of our Government concerned, this measure was evolved in order that there might be a clarification of authority and a concentration of responsibility for the development by our Government of further types of air transport to be of auxiliary military service. This measure is specifically designed to that end, and it will permit the five agencies of our Government which are concerned to concentrate under an Aircraft Evaluation Board here provided, subject to the subsequent appropriation of money, which it is not contemplated could be appropriated at this session. In the meantime, during the next 5 months, preliminary studies would be made, so that, next January or February, the Aircraft Evaluation Board would be able to come before the Congress, no time having been lost meanwhile, and ask for an appropriation to carry on the initial development of a type of aircraft as to

the development of which foreign countries are already 2 or 3 years ahead of us. Unless we now take action, we may, 2 or 3 years from now, find ourselves absolutely dependent upon the purchase of foreign aircraft or foreign-designed aircraft, in order to maintain air supremacy so far as the United States is concerned.

These are the reasons why I hope very earnestly, as the result of the intermediate developments, that this authority, which is unanimously recommended by everyone in our Government, by everyone in private industry concerned, and by all the Members of the Congress who have studied the matter in committee, may be given, and that we may get action on the matter this afternoon, after whatever discussion is desired by those who have any questions to ask.

POLITICAL NATURE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States delivered his message to the Congress explaining the reasons why this extraordinary session had been called and recommending to the Congress legislative proposals which he declared to be necessary for the preservation of our domestic economy and the maintenance of the economy and peace of the world.

The President's message was so blatantly political in all of its aspects and so amateurish and sophomoric from an economic standpoint as to insult the intelligence of the Congress and all people who pause to think for themselves.

Since the President has seen fit to attempt to use the Congress in a political campaign for his own political advantage, it seems entirely proper to view the President's message for what it is, namely, a pitiful appeal of a sinking politician for the continuance of political life. Not only does the message offer conflicting and impossible promises to every class, group, and contingent of our society, expressed in the vein of a political speech, but it was carried to millions of people over a national radio network at the expense of the American taxpayers under the guise of a national emergency. I know of no bolder use of the Public Treasury for campaign purposes. The prevailing opinion throughout the United States seems to have been that the President's calling of this extraordinary session was purely political. The message delivered to the Congress yesterday emphasizes the correctness of that opinion.

The President said that he had called the Congress into extraordinary session in order to deal primarily with high prices and with the housing shortage. He also said that production has increased and that we want it to increase still more. He pointed out that we have full employment, and that available materials are being used to the limit, that our full plant capacity is being utilized, thus recognizing that production in a free economy under a competitive enterprise system is today, as it has always been and as it always will be in the future, the basic answer to high prices. Yet, as a political sop to those who believe in a controlled economy, the President recommended every possible pol-

icy, practice, and control that would destroy the productivity of this country, which is the only basic economic answer to inflation.

First, he recommended that an excess-profits tax be reestablished. I doubt if any more devastating blow could be laid upon the productive efforts of the people of this country than the reimposition of an excess-profits tax. I doubt if a more effective method could be devised to increase and maintain high prices than to saddle the productivity of this country with an excess-profits tax. To destroy or take away the profit of producers simply destroys the ability of those producers to expand the production facilities of this country. Yet, the President in opening his political message had observed with amateurish candor and naive misunderstanding that all available materials and all plant capacity of this country were being fully utilized at this time. Frankly, I doubt if the President understood this economic inconsistency of his message.

Second, he recommended that consumer credit controls be imposed upon business. Every businessman who has had the slightest experience with mass production, which has been the magic key to the economic superiority of this country over all the nations of the world in both peace and in war, is keenly aware of the fact that the mass productivity of this country has been built upon and sustained by the extension and use of consumer credit. The regulation of consumer credit must inherently be lodged with the producer who extends that consumer credit in accordance with his business and competitive circumstances. That is a part of the essence of the enterprise system of this country and if allowed to work, it gives balance and stability to the national economy.

Third, the President recommended that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate bank credit. Again, I say that every man with any business experience appreciates the fact that the accumulation of capital assets which can be made available for bank credits is, in most cases, the only method by which plant facilities and raw materials can be increased, which means more production and consequently greater balance against inflationary trends. To impose burdensome controls upon bank credit is to restrict expansion of production, and thus lose the ballast that would bring the inflationary balloon to earth.

Fourth, the President recommended that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges. I wonder if the President understands that the purchase and sale of so-called "futures" is nothing more nor less than another avenue of credit for the commodity producer. It is the purchase and sale of rights in future production that mark the trend of supply and demand, and in turn, regulate and balance production with demand. The purchase and sale of "futures" is a common and well proved method of spreading market activity over nonproductive periods and is in full accord with the American enterprise system. Of course, it is true that

many speculators in the commodity market are financially injured or even financially destroyed by unforeseen circumstances, such as short production or surplus production, but such are the hazards of our competitive system, and the fact that there are financial casualties in this field of enterprise is no more argument for eliminating this field of business enterprise than for prohibiting the operation of automobiles because there are traffic casualties.

Fifth, the President recommended that authority be granted for allocation and inventory controls of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living. Now, I ask, does anyone know of any raw material that does not basically affect essential industrial production or does not have a direct bearing upon the cost of living? Under the President's own statement, this recommendation would include all raw materials, because, as I have already mentioned, he pointed out that all materials available were now being utilized in our productive efforts. I am sure we all understand that such controls imposed upon manufacturers and producers of consumer goods would be a devastating blow to the production program of this country and another boost for inflation.

Sixth, the President recommended that rent controls be strengthened and that larger appropriations be provided for enforcement of such controls. This recommendation followed on the heels of the President's previous statement that additional housing was one of the critical emergencies of this Nation and one of the reasons for calling this extraordinary session. Since the removal of rent controls from new houses, this country has witnessed and is today witnessing the greatest building program it has ever seen in its long history of expansion. Reimposing rent controls would, of course, destroy the incentive that is now promoting this tremendous building activity. Every city, town, and hamlet in this great country of ours is today a scene of feverish building activity. Every facility that can contribute to the building of more houses is being used. It should be remembered that the present building boom has developed during the past year and a half, since the removal of rent controls and other restrictions which the President would now reimpose. It should be remembered that for almost 5 years building in this country was at a standstill, and I now venture the prediction that we will balance our housing production with our demand in a shorter period than we were shut down under controls, notwithstanding the rapid increase of population and new families.

Seventh, the President recommended that stand-by authority be granted to ration those products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. He said that on the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used at all. It seems almost impossible that the President of the United States would be so lacking in the fundamentals of business

experience and so lacking in an understanding of human nature as not to know that the shadow of statutory authority inherent in any rationing law would impair and seriously damage the productivity of this country, and cause a rush of buying and hoarding that would bring upon us such inflation as we have not yet imagined. The very existence of such a law would create the shortage which the President and his bureaucrats are looking for to impose controls and return to us the iniquitous era of black markets.

Eighth, the President recommended that price controls be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. The same may be said about the enactment of price-control legislation as has been said with respect to stand-by authority for rationing. Both would lead to the same horrible result. The demagoguery of the President in this proposal is emphasized by his statement that noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. All wage increases, like all price increases, are inflationary, and both operate with equal force and effect. Merely because a wage increase can be absorbed by existing margins of profit does not mean that it is not inflationary. Simply because it does not result in a direct increase in the price of the related commodity does not mean that it is not inflationary. Even in these cases it means that the ability of the producer to expand production has been curtailed, and thus inflation encouraged.

Having disposed of inflation by these eight recommendations and thereby promised relief to all the people, the President then proposes that the Government launch itself upon a program of public spending for certain groups whose political support he hopes to get in November. He plugs for a housing bill which it is estimated would cost this country more than \$150,000,000,000, in addition to some \$20,000,000,000 which the Government already has in Government-owned housing and mortgage guaranties. Where is this vast amount of money to come from? The voters, who are the taxpayers, should understand that it is to come out of their pockets and be added to the national debt. What is to become of the Treasury surplus which Mr. Truman said we must build up through an excess-profits tax? It seems so academic that our already large national debt and continued national extravagance and wasteful spending are such important factors in existing inflation, that it is foolish to launch the Government upon a spending program of this magnitude, in direct competition with the greatest private building boom in all the history of the country.

As a further appeal to special groups, the President would have Congress continue public spending for the purpose of increasing Federal assistance to the States for educational purposes. No doubt, the President believes that this is a compelling appeal to the millions of school teachers of this country, but not only the school teacher but every other

citizen and taxpayer of this country will pay the bill through higher taxation, higher prices, and above all, the relinquishment of the right of the States to control their own local educational institutions. We know for a certainty that when the Federal Government takes over the financing of State educational systems and institutions, at the same time the Federal Government takes over control and regulation of those institutions, and thus another right of the people has been given up to the Central Government. As former President Hoover has suggested, those who favor such programs in the name of liberalism become liberals without liberty.

The President would continue his national spending program to increase benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

Purely as a political gesture, he recommends that the minimum wage be increased to 75 cents an hour. I say this is a political gesture because few, if any, workers in the United States are earning less than the proposed minimum wage. As a practical matter, under present circumstances, there can be no possible necessity for the Federal Government to put a floor under wages.

The President would have the American people double the burden they have already assumed by taking in and caring for 400,000 additional displaced persons outside and above the normal immigration quotas.

He would increase our national spending by underwriting the construction of a permanent home for the United Nations.

He would guarantee, as another political promise for the votes of the American farmers, an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per year.

He would expand the socialism of Federal power production, and thus add to the already heavy financial burden the people of this country are now carrying for that purpose. This is, of course, another political promise to those who are so situated as to enjoy the results of public power at the expense of all the people; incidentally, another way to distribute the wealth of those who have to those who have not, and a perfect program for destroying competitive incentive and private business enterprise.

As a political enticement to Federal employees, the President recommends a further increase of Federal wages.

Finally, the President urges upon the Congress various and sundry measures to protect and expand what he chooses to term "basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty." What greater basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty can be bestowed upon any nation than the right to live in a free economy under a private and competitive system that has made America the envy of all the world? Yet, for low political purposes the President would appeal to race prejudice and incite race against race and class against class. In my own mind, I am thoroughly convinced that the President and his political advisers who hope to retain the New Deal administration in power, are far more interested in the votes of various minority groups of the industrial centers of the North than they are in bettering the con-

dition of the Negro or any other minority group. To me, it is clear that the Constitution of the United States has not delegated to the Federal Government the powers which the President seeks under his so-called civil-rights program. But, in the true Rooseveltian philosophy the President hopes that the Congress will not be deterred by any constitutional doubts.

As political sop to the labor leaders, the President would have Congress repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law. Yet, he has resorted to the use of this law more than a dozen times since its enactment, in order to save his administration from embarrassment by the ruthless and unauthorized activity of labor racketeers who were originally invested with their power and arrogance by the practices and policies of the New Deal Party.

All in all, the President's program is one of continued higher and higher Federal spending on everything in order that the people shall do less and less for themselves, and the Government shall do everything for the people, such as insuring their health, federalizing their education, building their homes, boosting their wages, and raising the prices at which they sell, but at the same time lower the prices at which they buy. It seems to be assumed by the President that we are to forget that the Federal Government can give us nothing unless it first takes it from us. In short, the President's program is all things to all men.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH MEAT PRICES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for more than a year I have tried at every opportunity to encourage effective action to curb dangerously rising living costs. Neither I, nor any American who has to pay food bills, needs a special message from the President to tell him that prices are high and constantly going higher. The price of meat is a good example—and an important example, since meat represents about 30 percent of the total food bill.

It is tragic to make a political football of this problem. We need to get at the facts and deal with them as Americans interested in a common cause.

For an example concerning these facts, last year the Department of Agriculture advised farmers to sell hogs and cattle light. How much effect would that have on the available supply of meat that might be obtained out of those animals? I have heard today that the Department of Agriculture has already proposed, or will propose, that the production of beef cattle be reduced a very substantial figure in this coming year. I do not know how authentic that information may be. I intend to check it. But can we regulate the supply and then expect the much maligned law of supply and demand to operate? During the past few days the prices of wheat, corn, and oats, have fallen very materially—it is said because of the prospects of a bumper crop in the United States and a crop surpassing expectations in Europe. What effect are these facts, if indeed they are facts, going to have on the price of meat?

In the light of these circumstances, what would be the effect of restoring

OPA controls as the President proposes? I confess I do not know, and apparently the administration does not, for to date it has offered no specific suggestions.

Last year the Congress passed a bill to combat inflation, which became Public Law 395 on December 30, 1947. Under the provisions of that law it was proposed that the President take certain action when he felt that critical shortages were affecting the health or safety or national security or welfare of our people. That law provided that under such threatening circumstances the President could take the following steps: First, make a statement of the circumstances which he believed required price controls or rationing or any other Government action; second, outline a detailed procedure and program which the administration intended to follow; third, describe the extent to which the administration intends to go and the plans they intended to employ to combat the difficulty; and, fourth, provide—through the many agencies of the Government—a record of the factual evidence upon which the recommendations were based. Under this law, once the President had followed this logical fact-producing procedure, a congressional committee would be required to take action on his recommendations within 15 days.

That law has been in effect nearly 7 months during which time the President presumably has not believed the economic threat was sufficient to take the action suggested though prices have risen steadily. Then suddenly the President called a special political session of Congress and outlined several general proposals which he said should be adopted in view of rising prices. He apparently took advantage of only the first provision of the law, that is, he has made a statement of circumstances but he has not told us, or told the American people, whether or when or how the administration intends to apply price controls or rationing. He has not provided us with the factual evidence and information called for in this law. He has not told us to what extent the administration proposes to go or the specific formula to be employed—as the law outlines. The Congress, unfortunately, does not have the huge agencies or the 2,000,000 employees that are at the administration's command, and that are expected to be able to furnish much of this material.

The President has told us in a very general way that he would like to employ certain procedures and certain tactics in regard to high prices. Those are the same regulations that were employed once before. During the time they were in effect we had black markets, shortages, and constantly rising prices. That would seem to be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that these procedures are in themselves either ineffective or insufficient. It would, therefore, seem that the President should have used his agencies to determine a precise, detailed program so that the American people and the Congress could have some confidence that this serious matter was being approached realistically and effectively.

At the same time that the President issued a call for a special session of Con-

gress he made several comments concerning our economic status. He pointed out that in the last 14 years farm income has been multiplied about six times; that wages and salaries have quadrupled and that the total national income, profits, and wages, are nearly five times as high as they were 14 years ago. The fact that we are now paying nearly four times as many Government employees as we were in 1933 and the fact that the Government is spending nearly 10 times as much money were not mentioned. Nor was the fact mentioned that each of those increases has brought with it an increase in prices of consumer goods.

In other words, Mr. President, the administration would attempt to take political advantage of the good things that may have ensued in the last 14 years, but it does not want to take the responsibility for the things that have happened that are not so good, which are now troubling the American people, and which are in part due to the good things that have happened.

Under these circumstances there would seem to be a question as to whether the very general request to return to methods once before proven ineffective is not primarily a political move.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe it is solely and completely and entirely a political move. Therefore, it seems that the Congress is unfortunately required to use its own meager facilities to try to find out the facts and determine the best way to deal with this problem, since the administration has failed to take the action the Congress gave it the opportunity to take. I believe we can, right now, begin this program on one phase of high prices—the high price of meat.

Therefore, I shall, before concluding my remarks, submit a resolution requiring the Congress to inquire into the facts causing the deplorably high prices of meat so that the Congress will have immediately available the information which the administration has not provided, as the law requires that it should. It is unfortunate that the cooperation, once promised by the President, cannot be extended in this case so that the agencies of the Government would use their tremendous personnel and power to take effective, rapid action. Under the circumstances, we can only prepare for the time when a new administration will interest itself in high prices instead of politics.

Mr. President, these observations of mine are not highly partisan, although I am bound to admit that they appear to be so. I have tried to make them factual. The things I have stated here are in the books. But in order that I may bring to the support of the position I have taken an impartial point of view I should like to read briefly from an editorial in this morning's New York Times. The New York Times, as all Senators know, is one of the leading newspapers of the world. I believe its observations editorially are highly regarded and long have been and are looked upon in large part as impartial observations of public affairs. The title of the editorial, which I do not intend to read in full, but

from which I desire to quote, is "Mr. Truman on Inflation." I read from the editorial as follows:

The impression that Mr. Truman's anti-inflation program, presented to Congress yesterday, is likely to leave with many persons, we think, is that of a man trying to hit a specific target by standing off and throwing a handful of birdshot at it. Almost anyone who has ever heard the question of high prices discussed, it seems to us, could sit down with pad and pencil and, by jotting down a combination of the suggestions he had heard and remembered, produce about as satisfactory a balanced program as this. And if he was not troubled by considerations of political expediency, he might even score a large percentage of hits.

Mr. President, it will be noticed that many factors enter into the determination of the prices of commodities in this country, and to deal with some of them in a Presidential election year would be perhaps politically dangerous. But anyone who makes an impartial observation of the President's message on inflation, as evidently this editorial writer has, must come to the conclusion that the President has selected those things which might seem politically expedient, and eliminated those things which might have some dangerous political possibilities.

I read further from the editorial:

The presentation by Mr. Truman of the background of the inflation problem was, it seems to us, almost inexcusably superficial and slipshod, considering the importance of the occasion and the subject.

Those are not my words. Those are the words from the lead editorial of one of the leading newspapers of the world.

I read further from the editorial:

As to such proposals as the restoration of the excess-profits tax, the tightening of regulations on the commodity exchanges, the strengthening of rent controls, and drawing a line between inflation and non-inflationary wage increases—these suggest that the President, in formulating the program, may have been mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions.

Those are not my words. They are the words of the editorial.

I read further from the editorial:

Like the party platforms that came out of Philadelphia, it can be said that, while it may not have much to do with inflation, there is something in this document for everyone.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. When the editorial suggests that the President may have been "mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions," does not the Senator think that probably the editorial writer had in mind that he was under the influence of the Wallace convention more than of his own?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a pertinent inquiry; but I must confess that I am unable to answer it. It could very well be.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senator from Connecticut was reading from a communication on the question of prices, in which communication the question was raised that the President himself, or rather the executive department, had not properly advised the Congress as to the facts and figures on the basic cause of the high cost of living. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Was that a letter?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a statute of the Congress, signed by the President on the 30th of December 1947.

Mr. KILGORE. No—

Mr. BALDWIN. In the special session of the Congress last November, which was called to deal with inflation, one of the subjects contained in the agenda in the President's message, a specific formula was devised whereby the President could make an ascertainment of the facts, submit them to the Congress, and make specific recommendations. The law further required that the committee to which the recommendation was referred must act upon it within 15 days and make a report to the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator is begging the question. I am asking the Senator from Connecticut from what he was reading just prior to the reading of the editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was reading from notes which I had prepared for my own speech.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut is no doubt aware that the principal source of the statistics which the President is criticized for not furnishing the Congress is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and that the Congress so reduced the appropriations that at the present time it is unable to give the figures with complete accuracy. I know that, because today I called upon the Bureau for certain figures on the cost of meats. I was informed that the Bureau was unable, under the present appropriations granted by the Congress, to keep the necessary men in the field, where the sale of meats was taking place, to furnish the basic figures for a study of the reason of the high cost of meats.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to that observation that that is a dodge which has been used constantly by this administration to avoid responsibility for doing the things which ought to be done. When we were considering the appropriations last year one department cut down the number of inspectors at the border so as to bring home to the people of the United States the charge that this economy-minded Congress was interfering with its services.

I can think of nothing more important than the consideration of prices of food. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not a sufficient number of men to do that particular job, let it take men off some other job which is not so important, and do this job. That is what an industrial corporation or an individual in business would do. The practice of claiming, every time a question is raised, that there is no appropriation to take care of the work, is ridiculous. The appropriations

for this Government are four times what they were in the last peacetime year before the war. Yet it is claimed that there is not sufficient money to operate the Government. The reason is plain, downright inefficiency. The people of the country will have an opportunity next November to correct that situation, and I feel certain that they will do so. So I say to my friend that if in the large appropriations which are made for the Bureau of Labor Statistics there is not sufficient money to do this particular job, the department should come to Congress and ask for it. Why did not the Bureau take employees off work which was not so important and put them temporarily on this work? That is what would have been done in any other business. But in the Federal Government if there is no work to occupy a particular group of employees, what do they do? They sit down and wait until some work comes along. There is no administrative organization whatsoever in the Government to handle the problem in a business-like fashion. As a result the Bureau makes the excuse that its appropriations have been reduced. That is an old argument which has been used over and over again, and will be used constantly throughout the campaign.

Again I ask, if the Federal Government has four times as much in the way of appropriations as it had in the last peacetime year before the war, why can it not do some of these jobs, particularly this job, which is of vital importance and significance?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to contribute anything which might add to the heat which seems to be afflicting the Senator from Connecticut. However, it is true, as I am sure the Senator knows, that not only the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, but other divisions of that Department, presented their needs, as they assessed them, to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress at the session which adjourned in June. If they did not receive sufficient money from the Congress to do the work in which the Senator is interested, does the Senator contend that under the law the Bureau of Labor Statistics could invade some other bureau or division in the Department of Labor and take away from it men assigned to it or money appropriated specifically for some other bureau, in order to do the job about which the Senator is now speaking?

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Congress has always been very meticulous with respect to the invasion by any other bureau of funds appropriated by Congress for a particular bureau, even though it might have the authority under the law to do so, which is extremely doubtful. When Congress earmarks money for a division, bureau, or department, it is supposed to be expended for the purpose designated. Now and then funds are available to be used in a flexible way; but I do not recall that in the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, passed before adjournment, there was any such roving fund upon which the Secretary of Labor could

call, or from which he could draw additional money for the benefit of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to the question of my distinguished friend that I do not understand that all the employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are concerned with finding out the prices of meats. I do not understand that they are all meat inspectors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Meat inspectors?

Mr. BALDWIN. The point which my friend raised was that there were not sufficient appropriations to take care of funds for meat inspectors. Meat constitutes 30 percent of the cost of living today. It seems to me since that is one of the essential items, if we want to find out the facts, there are other inspectors who might be temporarily assigned to that particular job. Every business organization is operated on that basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. The meat-inspection service is in the Department of Agriculture, and the meat inspectors are supposed to inspect the quality of meat going from one State to another which may affect the health of the people. Certainly the Senator would not contend that the Bureau of Labor Statistics could go to the Department of Agriculture and draw from it meat inspectors, who may be able to pass on the quality of meat or whether it is pure or adulterated or spoiled, but who may not be able to pass on the question of whether the price of meat is too high.

Mr. BALDWIN. The point I make is that if a government, which in the present peacetime year has the largest number of Federal employees it has ever had in any other peacetime year, cannot find somewhere in the Bureau of Labor Statistics sufficient personnel to do this job, then it is an ineffective, inefficient government. That is my sole point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator will realize that Congress is always rather particular about appropriating money for divisions and departments. It earmarks it for certain purposes and delineates the duty of those who are employed under it. Certainly the Bureau of Labor Statistics has no pool in its own confines from which it may undertake to draw employees to do the work in undertaking to arrive at costs of production and the costs of consumers goods and other matters of that character.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator's experience is much longer and much greater than mine, but I ask him this question: Are all the employees in the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerned with the single matter of finding what is the price of meat?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. BALDWIN. Or is there a group of investigators there who could be used to investigate the price of meat one day and the price of bread another day and the price of vegetables another day?

I come back to the point that it is very strange indeed that a Government agency with a certain number of employees and an able and intelligent man at the head of it cannot be conducted in such a way that statistics pertaining to such an important matter as the high price of meat cannot be obtained for

want of funds sufficient to enable the employment of the necessary number of inspectors. Certainly there must be a sufficient number of inspectors in the Bureau.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the very natural question as to whether an employee in the Bureau of Labor Statistics who is an expert in regard to the price of clothing would be appropriately assigned tomorrow to determine how the price of meat is arrived at. I do not know about all the procedures in that Bureau, but I imagine that, as in any other well-organized bureau or division—and I am almost afraid to call it a bureau, for fear that the man who heads it may be called a bureaucrat, but at the same time it is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, created by Congress and called such by the Congress—there are experts qualified to look into and pass upon and report on the cost of various articles and consumers goods. Whether a person who is an expert on the cost of shoes would be properly assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high, I do not know. I do not think any of us here in the Senate would know. But I question the wisdom of the suggestion that because meat is a prime element in the cost of living, those who are investigating the cost of other things that go into the cost of living in this country should immediately be taken off their jobs and assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high. They may not be the best qualified persons for that purpose.

If the Senator could discover during this session—whether it is a long one or a short one—that there is not sufficient personnel in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to do the quick job of undertaking to find out why the price of meat is high, would the Senator vote for an additional amount necessary to enable the employment of the proper personnel?

Mr. BALDWIN. That would be one thing that the committee to be created under the resolution which I propose to submit could find out. That is another reason why the resolution should be adopted.

But this is the first information I have had and, so far as I know, the Senate has had that the particular agency upon which this particular statute calls—a statute which has been on the books since last December—does not have sufficient personnel to do the job to which I refer. Incidentally, let me say that the other day I heard it stated that employees are being added to the Federal pay roll at the rate of 500 a day. If that be so, there must be personnel somewhere to do this job.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, long ago I found out, as the Senator from Connecticut must have found out, that we cannot rely upon rumors and reports.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; and the statement in regard to the addition of 500 employees a day to the Federal pay roll is another thing which could be ascertained under the resolution to which I am addressing myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the resolution call for the appointment of a special committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; the investigation would be conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that that committee will meet tomorrow to go into the question of holding hearings. It already has authority and facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. I hope my resolution will be referred to that committee, so that it can consider the matter, along with other matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always very happy to have a suggestion from my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, first I wish to say that when we passed the Reorganization Act and established certain committees, to which we gave all the authority necessary for various investigations, we sought to do away with special committees. I myself have felt for a long time that we have had too many special committees, and that they were taking away from the standing committees jurisdiction which they properly have under the rules of the Senate. So I think the Banking and Currency Committee already has authority to do what the Senator from Connecticut proposes in the resolution. I was a member of that committee for a long time, and it never lacked jurisdiction to look into any question which had any relationship to legislation which it was asked to consider.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am not talking about special committees; but I am asking why it is that, after the Congress has passed a specific law laying down a certain procedure for the President to follow, and after the President has signed that law and it is on the statute books, the President does not avail himself of the procedure outlined in that law? When he has all the Federal administrative agencies at his disposal, and when he is the head of a great many administrative agencies and bureaus and departments of all kinds, why is it that the Congress of the United States then has to go back and look into the matter in detail, although it has only limited resources at its disposal and although its job is not of an administrative character, but of a legislative character, for its job is to act upon the specific recommendations of the President, and not to inquire into all the facts and circumstances. Those are the things I am asking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring to a law which was passed at the special session last fall?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read that statute lately. What particular provision of it is the Senator criticizing the President for not carrying out?

Mr. BALDWIN. It contains a provision that whenever the President shall find that a particular commodity is in short supply and that the state of affairs is such that the health and welfare of the people are affected, he shall make a statement of fact concerning the matter, shall require the administrative agencies to develop the facts and the situation, and shall make a recommendation to the Committee on the Economic Report, which shall report to the Congress with-

in 15 days. However, although the Congress began its session in January and although, as the President has said, all during that time prices have been going up, nevertheless not once during that time has the President availed himself of the provisions of that law.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the question whether any particular commodity has been getting in short supply and whether it is responsible for the increase in price. We know there has been a terrific increase of production in the United States, generally speaking, within the last 2 years and since the end of the war. We have full employment. We have almost complete utilization of our productive capacity. I do not refer particularly to meat. During the last year there has been, of course, a decline in the production of meat in the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. There was a decline in the supply of meat because of the specific recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. That is in the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring now to the little pig era?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had nothing to do with the little pig era. We went through that. However, the last era we went through was not an era of killing the little pigs, but it was an era of keeping the pigs from getting big, which is a somewhat different matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand there is no particular virtue in the age of a hog.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is the size.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not make much difference, either to the hog or to humanity, as to how old a hog should be when it is butchered.

Mr. BALDWIN. It makes a difference to humanity.

Mr. BARKLEY. But be that as it may, if the President had found there was a shortage of hogs and therefore a shortage of meat, under the law to which the Senator referred, certainly no act of Congress could have increased the supply. No proclamation by the President could have increased it. If the President had made a recommendation based upon a shortage in the supply of hogs, and consequently a shortage in the supply of meat, does the Senator think the Congress, in the situation in which it then found itself, and in the remainder of the session, would have inaugurated legislation to curb or to regulate the price of meat?

Mr. BALDWIN. My recollection of the special session last November is that there was a good deal of sentiment on both sides of the aisle in favor of providing some sort of regulation, of enacting some sort of legal provision to take care of items that might be in short supply. My distinguished friend will remember that, in his message to the Congress at that particular time, the President did not specifically say that he wanted price controls restored. He said he wanted legislation which would give him control over rationing and allocation of items in short supply. Meat is one of the items which is now in short supply and that condition has caused the high price. We do not have in the country enough meat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress did not give the President even that stand-by authority.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Congress gave him specific authority in the bill I am talking about.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Congress had given him even the stand-by authority, he could in the present situation do a good job. Nevertheless, Congress certainly could not and did not pass legislation restoring price controls. I do not think there was anybody on either side of either branch of the Congress at that time who recommended or approved the reimposition of price controls as they originally were during the war and for a period following the war.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct. If I may interrupt my friend, that is why I say we passed at that time a bill providing that the President could pick out items he might find in short supply, and with respect to which, for that reason, there was a dangerous possibility of a rapid increase in price. Having picked out such items, he could then make specific recommendations to the committee for action to be taken. That law has been on the books since last December. The President signed it. He has never done anything about it in all that time. That is the method, if my good friend will let me say so, by which the Congress undertook to deal with the specific recommendation or with the particular recommendation made by the President in his message. He wanted some law by which to deal with items in short supply, and that is the provision we made for it. He has never availed himself of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Congress cannot avoid its own responsibility by saying the President did not point out some article of food and recommend a particular piece of legislation in regard to it. Congress has all the facilities the President has for obtaining information. It can obtain information from every department, every bureau, every Federal agency. It can ascertain the facts. The mere fact that the President might point out a shortage with respect to some particular article of food does not in my judgment relieve the Congress of its responsibility.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may ask my friend a question, Does not the Constitution of the United States provide that the President shall execute the laws enacted by Congress? Is not that his job?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. BALDWIN. The law passed by the Congress provided a specific method of dealing with this particular question. The question I am asking is, Why did not the President use it? The law is upon the statute books.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the information available, he may not have been able to report to Congress that there was a shortage in a particular commodity.

Mr. BALDWIN. He does not necessarily have to report that there is a shortage. He could have reported that the price of a particular article was going up and that therefore some action was required. He did not do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have as always listened with a great deal of interest to what my friend from Connecticut has to say. There came to my mind several suggestions to make to him as he proceeded with his discussion. In the first place, he said, "What about these reductions of appropriations? Why do we not know something about that? Why can we not stop that?" I suggest to the Senator that the reports by the Appropriations Committees submitted to the Senate only a few months ago—in June, as a matter of fact—show distinctly why the situation is such in the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the Bureau does not now have sufficient money to send statistical gatherers into the field to get the material that is available.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large is the President's contingent fund? Does he have one?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The President cannot use the contingent fund for that purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. How many departments and agencies could be called upon by him for information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator would only pay attention to what has happened in the Senate, he would know that the Senate cut down or withdrew the President's contingent fund.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large a contingent fund does the President have?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what it is at the present time, but whatever contingent fund may be given to the President is given to him for a particular purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is given to him for contingent use, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, indeed.

Mr. BALDWIN. And this is a contingency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the President needed additional funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to enable the Bureau to employ additional personnel in order to furnish information in connection with the present session, he has a contingent fund and why did he not use it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assure the Senator he is quite wrong. That could not be done. If the Senator were a member of the Appropriations Committee, as I am, he would know that the Congress of the United States has specifically forbidden the switching of funds within a department from one agency to another.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may, as a junior Member of the Congress, I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, this question: What is the purpose of the contingent fund? Is it not to meet contingencies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The contingent fund had to do with national defense, not with domestic affairs. I may say to the Senator that consistently the Congress has been cutting appropriations in the very spots where we could hope to do something about this identical problem. For example, I call to the attention of the Senator the fact that the President in his budget submitted to the Congress

last January recommended specifically an appropriation to enable the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study of the price policies of the corporations controlling the commodities upon which the cost of living depends. The House of Representatives refused that appropriation. I sought to grant the authority, when the bill came to the Senate, and the authority was granted. It was written into the report. But when the bill went to conference the House conferees declined positively to allow an appropriation for that specific purpose. I suggest to the Senator that the reason the President's recommendation to conduct a study of the price policies of the profiteers was denied by this Congress was because this Congress has preferred to serve the profiteers rather than the people.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BALDWIN. We shall come to that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say another thing to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question we are dealing with here—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator suspend until the Chair can enforce the rule of the Senate with respect to the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Chair will indicate to those in the galleries that any further demonstrations, for any reason whatever, will result in a clearing of the galleries. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BALDWIN. My resolution has nothing to do with the profiteering corporations to which my friend from Wyoming refers. I may feel just as strongly about them as he does; but what we are talking about here is why the President of the United States did not carry out a specific law of the Congress which gave him authority to make specific recommendations for action by the Congress with reference to commodities and products in short supply.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to tell the Senator.

First, I should like to suggest to the occupants of the galleries who conducted a little demonstration a moment ago that it might be well for them to withhold their demonstration until they cast their ballots in the ballot boxes next November. That will be the time to show what they want done.

Mr. BALDWIN. It will be a little difficult for them to know what Democrats to vote for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not know, I think they will understand.

Mr. President, last November the President of the United States called Congress into special session, saying that there were two great public service needs which ought to be taken care of by Congress. The first was the control of inflation and the rising cost of living. The

other was European recovery. Congress reluctantly took care of the latter subject. With respect to the former, it declined to act. Oh, to be sure, it passed a voluntary allocation bill. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] felt, judging from their expressions upon the floor, that the President was right and that something should be done regarding the high cost of living. They were not satisfied with the bill which was approved by the majority leadership and which was passed by the Senate. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Connecticut offered an amendment to which the Senator from Connecticut has now referred. I took part in the debate and at that time pointed out to the Senator from Connecticut that the amendment which he and the Senator from Vermont were offering was inadequate, that it could not possibly do the job, and that it would be much more simple, instead of postponing the job, to do it at that time. But it was not done. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, whose duty it was to pass upon these questions, gave long and careful study to the problems. The Senator from Connecticut rose upon the floor, as the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress was coming to a close, and warned the majority leadership that something should be done. The Senator will recall it. He submitted a resolution which demanded an investigation, and he participated in the investigation.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Studies were made by subcommittees all over the country, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, and when they were completed there was not a single member of the committee who did not know about the shortage of meat and its increasing cost. There was not a single member of the committee who did not know that inflation had the people of the United States by the throat. There was a difference of opinion as to what should be done. The majority—

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator pause there for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say that the very best we were able to get out of the Congress at that time—and my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has volunteered the statement that he himself was then not in favor of rationing—was the legislation to which reference has been made. I claim that a very effective piece of legislation, proposing a very logical way of dealing with the subject, was the amendment which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and I proposed.

I am coming to the question which I have asked many times before. Why has not that particular legislation been carried out? Can the President of the United States say, "This is a law of Congress, but I do not like it. I am not going to observe it; I shall not follow the procedure it provides"? I do not think the Chief Executive can do that. He has never taken one single step under that legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator give me time to reply?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for it was that the President knew, as did the Congress, when the amendment was offered, that shortages existed. The President never once withdrew his recommendation for positive legislation. The reason nothing was done is that the legislation was utterly inadequate. What we need is more adequate legislation to do the job. The Senator's amendment was merely a polite postponement of the solution of the problem; and I fear, from what he says, that we shall do some more polite postponing—

Mr. BALDWIN. What we must do is to find out the facts which the President ought to have found out and submitted to us, rather than to make a general over-all buck-shot attempt to deal with inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that all he has to do is to follow the advice which the President gave the Members of the Congress when he said, "Ask your wife about the cost of living; she will tell you."

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a very familiar phrase; I started my speech with it. It is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator referred to me a moment ago as having said that I did not favor rationing. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I introduced a bill in the special session last year to carry out the President's recommendations. If those recommendations had been carried out and if the bill which I introduced had passed, we should not now be asked to consider the question. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it made the same progress there that the familiar snowball makes in the hot hereafter.

Mr. BALDWIN. It made the same progress that the Republicans made in the 14 years of Democratic administration.

I am sure that my distinguished friend does not mean to imply that since the legislation which was proposed by the Democratic side of the Senate was not adopted and the legislation proposed by the Republican side of the Senate was adopted there was no obligation, therefore, on the President of the United States to carry out its provision. He does not mean to imply that, does he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not make any such contention as that. Neither do I concede that the President of the United States has failed to carry out the intent or the provisions of the law.

Mr. BALDWIN. I most earnestly contend that he has failed.

Mr. President, a moment ago my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said we all knew about the shortages and that the President could have made recommendations for—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; that Congress could have acted.

Mr. BALDWIN. I say that the President could have acted, under the law.

Let me read to my distinguished friend what the law says:

Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material, commodity, or product which jeopardizes the health or safety of the people of the United States or its national security or welfare—

Whenever he makes such a determination, then he shall follow out the procedure of the law. If the Congress knew it, certainly the President knew it. The law contains the procedure. Why did he not make his recommendations?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. May I ask the Senator what the procedure is?

Mr. BALDWIN. Under the procedure provided for, the President makes a statement of the circumstances which, in his judgment, require the proposed conservation measures; a detailed method is provided for the administration of the proposed measures, including the additional budget and additional personnel necessary for their enforcement, and the proposed degree of curtailment, in current and prospective use of each such raw material, commodity, or product, by each processor, and/or user thereof, and a complete record of the factual evidence involved.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I served with the Senator on the committee in the eastern area of the United States. The Senator knows quite well that before we started the hearings we were all convinced that inflation was not only upon us but that prices were spiraling. We held hearings from New Hampshire to Florida. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before us and told us there would be a meat shortage in the spring and summer of 1948. He told the Senator, and he told me, and he told the other members of the committee, "Prices of meats are going up in the spring and summer of 1948." We did not need to have the President recommend anything. The Senator had that information. Now I understand the Senator is proposing another investigation. We do not need an investigation. We need to do something about inflation. It has been investigated too much, and we already have the information, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. What does the Senator propose to do? What would he propose to do now? What is his recommendation to this Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would accept the President's recommendation.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is the President's recommendation? Is there a bill here with the President's recommendation? What is that specific recommendation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator undoubtedly has a bill. But I am going back to last year. We were told that meats would be scarce, we were told that meats would rise in price. Now Senators come forward and want to blame somebody. Let us forget the past. Let us meet the problem now before us. Let us know that the cost of living is con-

tinuing to spiral, and let us do something about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with my friend wholeheartedly. Let us do something about it. But why is not something done about it by an administration which has 2,000,000 Federal employees, and all the Federal bureaus at its disposal? Where are the recommendations this law provides for? That is what I am complaining about. Until we know the detailed recommendation, I am really at a loss to know how to proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, the majority party does not know how to proceed; it has no program. It cannot act without the President of the United States telling it what to do.

Mr. BALDWIN. Apparently the President could not act without the Congress, because he called us back into session.

Mr. HATCH. The Congress is the legislative branch.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where is the specific recommendation? Where are the specific recommendations? Are they coming from the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The recommendations were before the Banking and Currency Committee. They were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The majority said, "We do not want to do these things."

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator knows our Government is a government of compromise. We cannot get everything and agree on everything all the time. We have to take the best we can get.

I come back to the point that there is now on the books a specific law, which has been completely ignored by the present administration. There is a statement in the law that whenever the President finds there is a shortage he shall make a recommendation for certain action. There has been no recommendation. There was no proposal of a special session to deal with inflation until the President went to the Democratic National Convention. That is what I am complaining about. Why has not this law been observed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator desires to be accurate. The President did make his recommendation. He made a recommendation in his special message of November 17, 1947. There he spelled out the facts. He told us what the shortages were; he told us that prices were rising. We knew it, and the Senator from Connecticut knew it, and because he knew it he besought his majority colleagues to do something, to take some action. But his majority colleagues would not act. They would not accept the suggestion of the President, and they came forward with this voluntary allocation bill, which is merely a surrender to big business, to ration the public. Then the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Vermont, knowing very well that that was inadequate, offered an amendment, which was merely, as I said a moment ago, a polite postponement.

May I analyze the law for the Senator, the law, with his amendment, the one

he asked the President to carry out? This is what he asks:

Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material—

He had already said so in November. He pointed out the shortage of housing at that time. He pointed out the rising price of meat. He pointed out that there was not enough to go around. So that was already done. But whenever he shall determine that—

he may prepare proposed measures for conserving such raw material—

He had prepared measures. They were here before the Congress. They were in the committee. The Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, had introduced the administration legislation. There it was, to be considered, but it was thrown into the pigeonhole.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did it not call for rationing; for price control?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It called for stand-by power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut is privileged, under the rules, in the absence of unanimous consent, to yield for a question and for a question only. We have been exceedingly lenient, it seems to me, in the last hour. Senators who have interrupted the Senator from Connecticut have been carrying on a discussion quite outside the rules of the Senate. In the absence of unanimous consent I shall ask for a strict enforcement of the rules.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Connecticut had yielded the floor to me for this purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had yielded to the Senator for a question; an observation. I am perfectly willing for him to make an observation, but I should appreciate it if the observation would pertain to the matter under discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it now that the acting majority leader and the Senator from Connecticut are resorting to a technicality to end this discussion. I shall not ask unanimous consent, though the Senator from Connecticut may, but when the Senator takes his seat, I shall take the floor and I shall proceed with the analysis of the very inadequate measure of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to respond very briefly to the query raised by the Senator from Oregon. It is the understanding of the Chair that the rules of the Senate provide that a Senator having the floor can yield for a question and for no other purpose. If he yields for other than a question he will automatically lose the floor if any other Senator raises a point of order. The Chair therefore feels that the rules of the Senate, which govern the conduct of Senators on both sides of the aisle, should, on demand, by any Senator, be literally interpreted and enforced by the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question,

Is it the desire of the Senator from Connecticut now to appeal to this rigid rule governing Senate debate in order to shut off this discussion? Is it becoming so annoying now to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Connecticut that they desire to have me take my seat? I shall be very happy to do so, and I shall take the floor a little later.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have sat here many an hour listening to his mellifluous and melodious voice, and I enjoyed it very much, and I am willing to continue the discussion on any terms which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may suggest. I may say to him, however, that both of us are subject to the rules of the Senate, so if any Senator raises the question, we must abide by the rules.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is nothing the Senator from Wyoming ever has said, and I am sure nothing he ever will say on the floor of the Senate, which has been or can be annoying to the junior Senator from Oregon. However, so long as I am acting in the capacity in which I now am, it is my duty to carry out my instructions as acting majority leader. Therefore I wish to advise the Senator from Connecticut that I shall have to ask for enforcement of the rules. I think he is making a valuable contribution to the RECORD this afternoon, but if he yields I must ask him to yield for a question and a question only. Then when the Senator from Connecticut finishes his remarks, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may speak in his own time. I have no desire to use any parliamentary tactics to deny the Senator from Wyoming a full opportunity to present his point of view. It is perfectly obvious, however, that we are working under a limitation of time in this special session, and it is the duty of the acting majority leader to call for strict enforcement of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator from Oregon to be acting under instructions?

Mr. MORSE. I am acting as majority leader in carrying out the policies of the majority party at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What a terrible spot to be in!

Mr. MORSE. One of those policies is, Mr. President, to abide by the rules of the Senate, and I raise the point of order, and shall insist on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to point out that the Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he will put his remarks in the form of a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Presiding Officer now has the whip hand, and I shall wait until I get the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely want to summarize my remarks, which, I think, have already been extended long beyond the patience of most Members of the Senate. In conclusion I want to say that whether we all like the particular bill which was passed by the special ses-

sion last fall or whether we do not like it, nevertheless it is the law of the land. It does provide a specific method of dealing with shortages, with rationing, with allocations, and with prices. It was adopted in response to a message from the President which asked for limited rationing and limited controls and stand-by legislation. It does provide a logical, specific method of dealing with the problem, and it is my claim that since its enactment and since its approval by the President on the 30th of December 1947, he has made no recommendation with respect to it, or made no effort, nor has any Government agency made any effort to carry out its particular provisions. I say, Mr. President, that had he done so we would have been equipped now or long since with adequate information and specific recommendations from the administration itself as to how to deal with the problem of the high price of meat.

Mr. President, I should like to call a matter to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who has left the floor. The question was raised that employees were not available in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to secure information for Presidential recommendation in pursuance of the law on the subject of meat. I find from the appropriation bill that in this current year, that is in the year 1948 and 1949, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has an appropriation of \$4,073,000. I find, Mr. President, that in the previous fiscal year, for 1947 and 1948, it had an appropriation of \$4,073,794. So, cutting the appropriation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics \$794 has made it impossible, according to the claim of my distinguished friends, for the Bureau to gather the information which will make it possible for the President to make the recommendations under this law.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 269), submitted by Mr. BALDWIN, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of meat.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than February 1, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ATTITUDE OF GOVERNOR DEWEY TOWARD THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have in my hand a clipping from the New York Times reporting an Associated Press dispatch appearing on page 3 of that newspaper, entitled "Tell of Dewey Role. Governor's Secretary, Senators ROBERTSON and TAFT Quoted."

WASHINGTON, JULY 27.—Senator ROBERTSON, Republican, of Wyoming—

For whom, of course, we in this body have a deep regard—

told reporters today that Governor Dewey had advised congressional leaders to stay around a week or so and then go home. He asserted Senator TAFT had carried Mr. Dewey's message to the policy committee.

At Pawling, N. Y., Governor Dewey's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, said:

"The Governor feels that the Congress should stay in Washington and give careful consideration to whatever was proposed in the President's message."

That is version No. 2. But we are not through yet.

Asked about consultations between Governor Dewey and congressional leaders Senator TAFT said:

"There has been more or less consultation with Dewey but not in detail."

He added that Herbert Brownell, Jr., Mr. Dewey's campaign manager, had conferred with congressional leaders.

Governor Dewey made no recommendations at all but was consulted, Senator TAFT stated.

So in one story of four paragraphs we have three different versions of the attitude of the leader of the Republican Party on the reconvening of the Congress. In all fairness, without any bitterness, I think that the leader of the majority party in this Congress would certainly do well to let the American people in on the secret of just which one of these versions is true.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I have responded to the call of the President for this special session of the Congress. When we adjourned a few weeks ago I think we all hoped there would be no extraordinary occasion justifying such a call. There has been practically no change in our domestic affairs since we adjourned and the call was not made to meet any foreign situation. The President has evidently concluded that we did not finish our work before we adjourned. He also has evidently decided that it is not a wise thing for us to adjourn when the two Houses agree; that the Executive should make that decision and not the Congress itself.

There will be much argument among the people of the Nation as to whether we were called here with the hope and expectation of accomplishing something really worth while or whether we were called for a purpose which reflects no credit upon the Chief Executive.

I think one suggestion made by the President in his speech accepting a re-nomination, at which time he announced

that an extraordinary occasion had arisen and he was calling a special session of the Congress, was wholly unfair to the Congress. He set forth what he wanted the Congress to do and then stated to the world that it could be done within a period of 15 days if the Congress wanted to do it. This statement was made by a man who had been the Chief Executive for several years and in addition to that had had several years experience in this body. To attempt to make the great body of the American people, inexperienced in Federal legislation, believe that he was stating a fact and that the failure of Congress to do what he said was a practical thing to do, was much more than unbecoming; it was intended to reflect upon the integrity and energy of the Congress and to belittle it in the minds of the people.

In order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day we convene, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I call attention to the fact that the distinguished minority leader has now become the acting majority leader, inasmuch as he occupies the majority leader's seat. We welcome him to this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that I stepped across the aisle to talk to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I should like to continue.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. BUCK. No, Mr. President; I will not. I shall conclude in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor and refuses to yield at this time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, what I said was that in order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day Congress reconvened, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning. If the minority leader's answer should be in the affirmative, then I should like an expression from some of his distinguished colleagues on that side of the Chamber, such as the Senators from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and other Senators who are opposed to the President's civil-rights program. The history of efforts to legislate upon this subject demonstrates, it seems to me, that there could be no hope

of getting this legislation through this body in such a short period, and this must have been known by the President at the time he made his statement.

There were other statements made in that speech that were misleading. He was addressing the delegates who had a short time before selected him as their standard bearer for the next election. The delegates in their platform had declared:

The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible for the existing and ever-increasing high cost of living.

The President declared that the Eightieth Congress had demonstrated that special privilege controlled the Republican Party. He undertook then to demonstrate this to his enthusiastic audience and to the country by showing what they had done and what they had failed to do. One of the things that was supposed to prevent the high cost of living was price control, and to the cheering delegates the President declared:

Time and time again I recommended the extension of price control before it expired on June 30, 1946. That price-control legislation didn't come to my desk until June 30, 1946, on the day on which it was supposed to expire, and it was such a rotten bill that I couldn't sign it.

Thirty days after that they sent me one that was just as bad, and I had to sign it, because they quit and went home.

What the cheering delegates and millions of people did not realize at the moment in connection with this "rotten bill" was that the Congress which "quit and went home" was not the terrible Eightieth Republican Congress that was controlled by special privilege, but was the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress of the people, the progressive Congress, the Congress which had the opportunity to do all the things the President in his message to Congress yesterday asked us to do in a period of 15 days. Maybe we ought not to feel so bad after all, about being charged by the President with being the worst Congress in the history of the Nation. But before leaving this subject suppose we take a look at the "rotten bill" which the Democratic Congress presented to the President. That bill had in it a provision denying the OPA the right to force anyone to sell a product at a loss. Perhaps that was what made it such a "rotten bill." The President must have been afraid that special privilege had gotten its foot in the door of the Democratic Congress.

Let us pursue the subject a little further and see how consistent the critic of this Congress has been upon this subject. The "bad bill" which the President was forced to sign because the Congress quit and went home restored the OPA to power but gave the President the right to end meat and other price controls at his pleasure. This Democratic Congress placed the matter of control squarely up to the President; and believe it or not, the President, by Executive order just before the election in 1946 took control off meat, and a little later took control off other important items. The so-called special privilege crowd must have gotten its foot into the

White House door as well as the door of the Democratic Congress.

There were some important things which the President and other Democrats left out of their speeches at the convention. They blamed the Republicans for the high cost of living. They gave credit to the Democrats for the recovery from the depression; but not a word was said by any of them about the increase in the Government debt and the increase in the annual budget. The truth is that the Government records show that the cost-of-living index stood at 97.6 at the end of 1932, and at the end of 14 years, when the Eightieth Congress came into control of legislation, that index stood at 153.3. Under the Democrats the cost of living had increased 57 percent. The Federal debt at the end of fiscal year 1932 was \$18,200,000,000. By 1941 it had been increased to forty-seven billion eight hundred million, or more than two and one-half times in 9 years. Then came the war years, and by 1945 it stood at two hundred and forty-seven billion. The expenditures for 1932 amounted to a little less than five billion; by 1941 it had increased to nearly thirteen billion; and by 1946 it was a little more than sixty-five billion. These cobwebs which the Republicans have promised to clear away next year have certainly cost the people a great deal of money. The matter is too serious, however, to be treated lightly, too serious to be solved within a period of 15 days in midsummer. The President is in no position to do it. The country, as well as his party, has lost confidence in him as a leader and as an executive. He has succeeded in dividing the Democratic Party into three parts. One part is making a great effort to gild what it believes to be the Russian lily; another part has been forced into a corner where it desperately fights for the principle of States' rights; and the President, as the leader of the other part, calls this Congress, which he in desperation has called the worst Congress in our history, for the purpose of strengthening his own political position. He cannot escape responsibility for the bitterness existing among the political parties and factions, and this comes at a time when the whole world is in a turmoil, when a prayer for peace is on the lips and in the heart of every good American man and woman, and when unity should be the watchword. One thing is certain. The call of this Congress is not likely to be helpful in the progress we have made in eliminating racial and religious discrimination. If anything is done that will be helpful to the Nation it will be done under most difficult circumstances. If there be any extraordinary occasion existing in this country it is not one for this Congress. It is one for the people of the Nation in November, and I trust they will appreciate the opportunity that confronts them and give us a President who will make a new approach to the problems of the Nation.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL-TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adapt-

able for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if possible, I should like to dispose of the unfinished business today; but before doing so I think it would be well to ask for a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that the acting majority leader has been advised that there will be a series of speeches on his proposed legislation. I understand from the Secretary of the Senate that certain Senators interested in this bill have been informed that no action would be taken this afternoon and several of them have left the precincts of the Senate. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that the Senator from Maine make such statements in support of his bill as he cares to make this afternoon, and that the Senate then take a recess and proceed with the discussion of his bill at the opening of the session tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that I may anticipate an opportunity to discuss the bill tomorrow?

Mr. MORSE. I am advised that it will be the pending business when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, following a recess tonight. It is very doubtful if there is any hope of concluding debate on the Senator's proposal this evening. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that we proceed with the debate until perhaps 5 o'clock, and then take a recess.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, inasmuch as earlier in the session I made a statement regarding the bill, it would be better if we could take a recess at this time and take up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine withdraws his request for a quorum call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That during the present special session of the Congress, in the interests of efficiency and conservation of time, no Senator shall speak more than once, on any subject, and no more than 30 minutes thereon.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution constitutes a change in the rule of the Senate which requires a formal notice, and a resolution making such a change would have to lie over. It seems to me it would

be unfair to try to adopt such a resolution at this time of day.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur in the Senator's thought. But would not the Senator think it a "blessed event" if we could obtain such a procedure in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have often expressed my belief that the Senate rules should be modified in behalf of the prompt passage of legislation, but I doubt whether this is the proper way to do it.

Mr. TOBEY. I refer to the special session, particularly.

I wish the Senator would tell me how we could properly do what I have proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not like to be required to do that now. I might take more than the 30 minutes as provided by the Senator's resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall come back to the Senator about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the resolution will lie over for a day.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou prayer-answering God, we are again invoking Thy blessing, beseeching Thee to make our minds and hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that daily we may strive to bring to fulfillment those spiritual ideals and aspirations which Thou hast implanted within our souls.

Enable us to release the hidden splendor of struggling humanity, emancipating it from everything that mars and degrades the image of God in which we have been created.

Fill us with a passion to lead men and nations out of the darkness of night into the radiant light of that new day which will be more blessed than our fondest hopes.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the